Dialogue on Urban Issues II

A Series of Discussions with
Prominent Speakers on
Current Urban Policy Issues
Canadian Urban Institute Breakfast Seminars
Autumn 1991

Urban Focus Series 91-4

Dialogue on Urban Issues II

A Series of Discussions with
Prominent Speakers on
Current Urban Policy Issues
Canadian Urban Institute Breakfast Seminars
Autumn 1991

URBAN FOCUS SERIES 91-4

92-05683/

© Canadian Urban Institute, 1992
ISSN: 1183-2304 ISBN: 1-895446-24-4
Dialogue on urban issues II
(Urban focus series: 91-4)

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data
Main Entry under title:
Dialogue on Urban Issues II

(Urban Focus Series; 91-4)
ISBN: 1-895446-24-4
1. Cities and Towns - Canada. 2. Urban Policy - Canada. I. Canadian Urban Institute II. Series

HT127.D532 1992 307.76'0971 C92-093898-1

The Canadian Urban Institute is a new, independent, non-profit organization, dedicated to helping large cities face the formidable challenges ahead in local government and urban management.

The Institute's programs focus on information exchange, training, and applied research. The Institute aims to bring together participants from the public, private, non-profit, and academic sectors to achieve a multi-disciplinary, multi-sectoral perspective on a range of urban issues. Programs operate or are being developed for the Greater Toronto Area, the rest of Canada, developing countries and Eastern Europe.

Contents

1	**Introduction**	3
2	**Local Government Policy: Priorities for the 1990s** A Presentation by the Honourable Dave Cooke, Minister of Municipal Affairs of Ontario, September 13, 1991	6
	Discussion	8
3	**Two-Tier Metropolitan Governments: Their State of Health** A Presentation by Lionel Feldman, President LDF Consulting September 27, 1991	12
	Discussion	15
4	**Local Heroes: Customers in the Greater Toronto Area** A Presentation by David Weinberg, President, CIBC Development Corporation, October 11, 1991	19
	Discussion	26
5	**How to Be Mayor of Toronto** A Presentation by Art Eggleton, Mayor of Toronto October 25, 1991	30
	Discussion	33
6	**Policing Issues in the 1990s** A Presentation by Susan Eng, Chair, Police Services Board of Metropolitan Toronto, November 8, 1991	37
	Discussion	39
7	**Children First: Differences in Direction Between Municipalities and School Boards** A Presentation by Fiona Nelson, Trustee, Toronto Board of Education, November 22, 1991	43
	Discussion	45
8	**Why Hasn't the Greater Toronto Area Vision Happened Already?** A Presentation by Jane Pepino, QC, partner, Aird and Berlis, December 6, 1991	49
	Discussion	55
9	**List of Participants**	59

1. Introduction

Where is the Greater Toronto Area heading? Where should it be heading? What kind of government structure should it have? What has worked in other countries? Why haven't regional plans been implemented in the Greater Toronto Area in the past? What are the barriers now? What are the province of Ontario's priorities for the region? What would the development industry like to see happen? How should education fit into a broader vision of our urban future? How do we tie together policing and urban planning? What does the mayor of Toronto think about the future of the region?

These are just some of the questions addressed in a series of seven breakfast seminars organized by the Canadian Urban Institute in the fall of 1991. This was the second series in a program that begin in the spring of 1991, when six speakers carried on a dialogue with people from the Greater Toronto Area involved in urban issues. The spring series was kicked off by the Honourable Ruth Grier, Minister responsible for the Greater Toronto Area, who was followed by the Commissioner of Community Services for Metro Toronto, the Secretary-General of the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (the head office of which moved to Toronto in the fall of 1991), the Mayor of Mississauga,, the Director of Policy and Research of the Quebec Ministry of Municipal Affairs, and the Associate Director of Housing and Urban Development for Montreal. A publication was produced by the Institute in the summer of 1991, containing summaries of the seven presentations and discussions.

This publication covers the seven seminars in the autumn of 1991. Once again the introductory speaker was a minister - this time the Honourable Dave Cooke, Ontario's Minister of Municipal Affairs and Government House Leader. Cooke's presentation sets out succinctly the province's local government policy priorities for the 1990's: good planning, disentanglement of provincial and municipal functions, community economic development and the promotion of good local government. Much of the discussion deals with the implications for the Greater Toronto Area of the province's disentanglement and planning initiatives, as well as potential steps to improve the economic development climate in the region.

Lionel Feldman, one of Canada's most distinguished urban consultants, was the second speaker in the series on the topic of two-tier metropolitan governments in Canada and abroad. He describes some of the difficulties other metropolitan governments are facing and draws some lessons for the future concerning the governance of the Greater Toronto Area. The discussion covers such topics as the impact of partisan politics, financial responsibilities for providing services, geographic definitions of "community" and the relationship between planning and government structure.

The third speaker, David Weinberg, President of CIBC Development Corporation, gives a private sector view on the future of the Greater Toronto Area. Weinberg's main theory is that just as CIBC and other developers have had to modernize their buildings in order to retain their tenants in a period of fierce competition, so the infrastructure of the Greater Toronto Area must be updated for the Toronto area to retain its attractiveness for investors. Weinberg presents a number of recommendations as to how governments could improve the effectiveness of their operations and structures in the interest of good development. The discussion touches on the potential for public-private collaboration in the provision of infrastructure, the impact of the planning process on development, comparative levels of local taxation and ways of simplifying government accountability.

One of Art Eggleton's last activities as mayor was to speak at a seminar on the topic "How to be Mayor of Toronto". He uses the occasion to reflect on the various roles he had to perform: the ceremonial role, the chairmanship of council, the chief executive officer of the city and the political leader of the municipality. He offers some tips to his successor as well as highlighting some of his own successes and failures. The discussion deals with such topics as the relationship between the city and Metro, political parties in civic politics, the international activities of the city, the pros and cons of a chief administrative officer system and the future governing structure of the Great Toronto Area.

Susan Eng, the chair of the Police Services Board of Metropolitan Toronto, presents her views on policing issues in Metropolitan Toronto in the 1990's. She goes through many of the changes in the urban environment the police are having to adapt to and the challenges involved in a more community-based and less hierarchical system. She set out the relationship she sees between the board, the police and the municipality and the issues involved in setting priorities. The dialogue deals with the issues involved in integrating approaches to policing across the Greater Toronto Area, the relative need for provincial and municipal appointees on police boards, training priorities, the links between policing and land-use planning and the potential for further "civilianization" of police activities.

Fiona Nelson, a long-time member and former chair of the Toronto Board of Education, speaks on some of the differences and possible areas of collaboration between school boards and municipalities in dealing with children. She proposes a range of collaborative activities between school boards, schools, municipalities and other agencies that could turn local schools into real community centres. In particular, she suggests that many public health, environmental and cultural activities for children could be creatively delivered by the schools, thereby providing an effective response to community needs. The discussion centers around ways of simplifying structures, cutting across departmental frontiers, creatively operating in a period of fiscal constraint and alternative ways of organizing local communities.

The final session covered in this volume features a stimulating presentation by Jane Pepino, QC, one of the leading planning and development lawyers in the Toronto area, on the topic "Why Hasn't the Greater Toronto Area Vision Happened Already?". She analyzes past attempts at designing and implementing strategic plans in the Toronto region, and the bureaucratic, legal, political and financial hurdles that prevented them from coming to fruition. She makes an appeal for political leadership in overcoming obstacles and getting things done if the current Greater Toronto Area exercise is to succeed. The discussion touches on the desirability of proceeding by consensus or fiat, on the need for changes in attitudes, in governing structures and planning legislation, and on the necessary linkage between planning visions and economic and fiscal realities.

The Canadian Urban Institute breakfast seminars have gradually become a recognized forum for an ongoing dialogue among experts and decision-makers on urban issues-particularly those relating to the future of the Greater Toronto Area. The participants in the autumn series are listed as an appendix to this publication. They represent a combination of provincial and municipal officials, smaller numbers from the academic, legal, planning and consulting fraternities and a growing number from private sector companies with a stake in the future of the region.

The breakfast seminar series is continuing in 1992 and will continue to be held in the cities of Toronto and North York. It has been organized by Don Stevenson, with assistance from other member of the Canadian Urban Institute.

Richard Gilbert
President

2 Local Government Policy: Priorities for the 1990s

A Presentation by the Honourable Dave Cooke, Minister of Municipal Affairs of Ontario, September 13, 1991.

Richard Gilbert opened the fall series of breakfast seminars of the Canadian Urban Institute by introducing the Hon. Dave Cooke, Minister of Municipal Affairs of Ontario. He said that the Minister was one of the most popular politicians in the province, both because he had received over 71 per cent of the votes cast in 1990 in his home riding of Windsor-Riverside, and because almost twice as many people as there were available spaces had asked to come to the morning seminar.

Mr. Gilbert said that the Minister had begun his political career by being elected as a school trustee in Windsor while still in his twenties. He was first elected to the Ontario Legislature in 1977 where he served, among other duties, as critic for housing and for finance matters as well as being appointed NDP house leader while in opposition.

When the NDP came to power in 1990, Cooke was appointed to two portfolios as Minister of Municipal Affairs and Minister of Housing. With the recent cabinet shuffle he retained the Municipal Affairs portfolio and was also given the important task of Government House Leader.

Mr. Cooke opened his remarks by saying that the overall goal of the Ontario government was to promote community well-being, the health of the economy and the fair sharing of the wealth of the province. In the short run, the recovery from the recession is the prime goal.

He said that the achievement of these goals required a coordinated effort from all sectors of society and from both provincial ministries and municipal governments. He used the example of the future of the Greater Toronto Area as an issue requiring coordination. For this purpose the Greater Toronto Coordinating Committee had been established, the IBI reports on future urban forms and the Crombie Commission report on the Toronto area watershed had been published.

Cooke said that the discussions to date with municipalities in the GTCC had revealed a remarkable degree of consensus on the broad course of future development in the GTA. Municipalities had accepted the challenge of planning for the accommodation of some two million more people in the region in the next thirty years in the context of sustainable development and greater environmental protection. It is now vital to ensure that the future plans of municipalities and new investments in infrastructure are compatible with an agreed vision.

He said that with four million people now, the Greater Toronto Area will set the pattern for the rest of the province. He committed his ministry to work with the municipalities to ensure that land use planning reflects GTA goals including provisions for urban intensification, more affordable housing and sustainable development initiatives.

The minister then set out some of his ministry's accomplishments in the first year in office of the NDP in the context of the priorities he sees in provincial-municipal relations in the next few years.

First, he referred to the objective of good planning. He said he had heard many complaints that there were too many delays in the planning approvals process and that there was a need for a planning system that worked efficiently while providing an opportunity for the participation of all interested parties. This was the reason for the appointment in June of the commission of inquiry into the relationship between public and private interests in the planning process under the chairmanship of John Sewell and with Toby Vigod and George Penfold as commissioners. The commission will try to shape a consensus on planning issues among developers, local politicians and interested members of the community. The commission has been given two years to report. The government has committed itself to involving the members of the commission in the implementation of the report in an effort to ensure action.

The second priority the minister set out was disentanglement - a challenge that is finally being understood. Mr. Cooke said that voters have made it clear that they want a simpler and more accountable form of government. The Hopcroft report which was made public early in the year represents one of the models for greater disentanglement of provincial and municipal functions as does the report of the Provincial-Municipal Social Services Review. A secretariat under an assistant deputy ministry has now been set up in the ministry to work on the disentanglement exercise. A political provincial-municipal steering committee has been established consisting of himself and the ministers of Community and Social Services, Education, Treasury and Economics, Transportation and Environment as well as AMO representatives John Harrison, Helen Cooper, Ron Keeling, Joe Mavrinac, Mabel Dougherty and Scott Cavalier. An advisory committee has also been established with representatives of labour, management and other sectors. Mr. Cooke stressed that the exercise must tie into the ongoing work of the Fair Tax Commission and the review of educational finance. The end result should produce much clearer lines between municipal and provincial responsibilities.

The third priority the minister set out was community economic development. He said that the province was ready to undertake a greater responsibility in this area than it had in the past. He was now working on a clearer role for the ministry in this enlarged provincial mandate.

He said as an example that the province had recently put $16 million in the PRIDE Program. He was, however, open to new ideas from all quarters. There had been a discussion of this topic at the recent inter provincial meeting of ministers of municipal affairs where he had learned what some other provinces were doing.

The Minister's fourth priority was described as promoting good government. The ministry is now working on new conflict of interest legislation in light of the fact that the old legislation proved almost impossible to enforce. The ministry is also working on legislation on open council meetings and on the disposal of public assets. The government has already adopted some changes to the Election Expenses Act and will see how these changes work before initiating other changes.

In concluding his opening remarks, Mr. Cooke said that all of these priorities must be tackled within the context of the goal of economic renewal in the province. He pointed out that the economic impact of the recession in Ontario had been scary. Three-quarters of the jobs lost in Canada were in Ontario, which had lost 23 per cent of its manufacturing employment. Places like Windsor and St. Catherines now have the highest unemployment rates in Canada. To develop a sustainable economic recovery, the minister said that the economy must become more adaptable with a greater stress on high technology activity.

Discussion

The discussion began with a question as to whether it was possible to envisage in the context of disentanglement different sets of local responsibilities in the Greater Toronto Area than the rest of the province. The minister replied that a vision for the future of the GTA was now being worked on in the office reporting to the minister responsible, the Hon. Ruth Grier. He said there had been much discussion on this complex subject in government already. He said that anything decided on for the GTA would have great implications for the rest of the province and that there was a risk that if arrangements for the GTA differed too much from those applying in the rest of the province there could be strong opposition. While he acknowledged that needs in the GTA are different from those in the rest of Ontario, he cautioned that two provinces should not be created.

A participant suggested that different roles for the provinces and the municipalities may be a topic of discussion in the forthcoming constitutional discussions and that an exercise had already begun in Quebec on decentralization within the province on the premise that the province would gain more power. He asked if the minister intended to take this into account in the disentanglement exercise. In response the minister stressed that means of maintaining province-wide standards must be a focus even while disentangling delivery functions.

A participant said that the role of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs had been described as that of a support ministry. He asked whether it also had a leadership function. In reply the minister said it must both be a support to municipalities and a leader in provincial-municipal relations. In the field of community economic development, for example, the minister said that at least three ministries were involved: Municipal Affairs with the PRIDE program, Industry, Trade and Technology with the development corporations and Agriculture and Food with its rural economic development programs. It was essential that there be a body to coordinate these local economic development programs and that turf wars be avoided.

A member of the audience said that municipalities should take on a more proactive role in local economic development. Most municipalities, he said, did not have the human resources nor the information to take advantage of opportunities. More training, he suggested, was required. Mr. Cooke agreed that municipalities should be encouraged to hire and train appropriate staff. He said that some municipalities like Sudbury had done very well in diversifying their economies through creative economic development programs.

A participant said that Metro Toronto was in a tough position to attract economic development with the third highest tax levels in North America and a legislative prohibition of municipal tax incentives which were common in the United States. She added that Metro had done a major paper on disentanglement which stressed that the financial implications were a vital aspect of any such exercise. If functions were to be decentralized, dollars must accompany the function.

On the disentanglement issue, the minister agreed that the financial impact must be part of the disentanglement exercise. He said the secretariat would be working on the implementation and the financial impact of any proposals. He added that the Treasurer of Ontario was on the steering committee.

With regard to a possible municipal tax incentive capacity, the minister said he had no firm position. He said that a pilot project was being carried out in Windsor on a possible municipal 30-year tax exemption for investment in a new arena facility which would then revert to the public sector. The potential impact of this pilot project will be evaluated to see if it could be turned into a more general policy. The minister said the government would look at a number of U.S. examples of municipal tax incentives to see if anything could be incorporated into a more general provincial plan.

A participant expressed his concern that Ontario is spending more than it can afford and asked if anyone were looking at local economic development in this context. He said mechanisms were needed to help focus on what is reasonable and affordable. He suggested, for example, that there were too many levels and structures of local government in Ontario. He said that it was tough to get business done in Metro because projects could be held up for four or five years for bureaucratic or intergovernmental reasons. He said that clever people could find ways to delay almost any project.

The minister responded by saying that this would be one of the main priorities of the Sewell Commission. He said the rules of the planning process must be clear up front. There must be an opportunity for participation but then there must be finality.

The questioner then said that the Sewell Commission should have had a developer among its members. The minister said that it had been a deliberate decision not to. He said the government wanted people on the Commission who could bring the various parties together rather than having it formed by representatives of the interested constituencies.

Mr. Cooke said the government was very aware of the need to get its costs under control and make Ontario more competitive. He said that cost control was particularly important in the health area, where Ontario's health care budget is $17 billion, more than the entire budget of the state of Michigan. He added that Ontario was more honest in its budgeting than almost all similar governments because it did not separate ordinary and capital expenditures when it came to defining a surplus or a deficit. He suggested that it might make sense to take the example of the proposed sewer and water corporation and put more of the province's capital expenditures into separate capital accounts.

The questioner continued his argument by saying that taxes were $10 - $14 per square foot for buildings in downtown Toronto - very high in the North American context. He said investors are leaving Toronto and a tax revolt is beginning. He repeated his plea that Ontario focus on what could be afforded. In reply, the minister pointed to the decision not to introduce public auto insurance and said the government had not introduced any major new expenditure programs. He said both the province and the municipalities would have to concentrate on what they could afford. With regard to local government structures in the GTA, the minister said he was concerned that proposals for change would have the tendency to swamp other important issues in the public debate.

In answer to a question about an overall provincial economic plan, the minister said the government was looking forward to releasing a economic development strategy next year.

A questioner asked the minister what relations existed between the Crombie and Sewell Commissions. The minister replied that Messrs. Crombie and Sewell have been in communication. He added that Crombie's mandate related only to the GTA while Sewell has been asked to come up with recommendations applicable to the whole province. He said that some of Crombie's principles are generally applicable while others are not.

A participant said he had been disappointed that the Sewell Commission had not been asked to look at the deeper potential relationships between the development industry and the municipalities. He said it was important for both developers and municipalities to operate within the context of an overall framework. He urged that any implications that commission was looking at the sleazier aspects of recent developments be removed in favour of a more constructive orientation.

The minister assured the questioner that the commission would focus on broad planning issues and would aim to facilitate consensus-building and common frameworks among all participants. He said the police were already investigating the specific situation in York region and it would have been a mistake to give the Sewell Commission an overlapping mandate.

A participant said there was a great problem with the current planning process which was leading to economic problems. He said that municipalities could give no assurances to developers because the environmental review process had taken over the traditional planning system and the green movement had taken over that process. The minister said he was very aware of the problem and that the relationship between the Planning Act and the Environmental Assessment Act must be dealt with. He said the environment must be protected but the system must not be manipulated to prevent good development.

A representative of the Metro Board of Trade said that his organization supported urban intensification as an essential part of good planning. He asked how the concept could be sold to the public and local politicians. In reply, the minister said the ground-work must be done in the community and that both the public and private sectors should take leadership roles.

3 Two-Tier Metropolitan Governments: Their State of Health

A Presentation by Lionel Feldman, President LDF Consulting, September 13, 1991.

Richard Gilbert introduced Lionel Feldman by saying he had been a presence in the upper reaches of the Toronto area municipal scene for over 25 years. He said that Feldman had worked in government, for the Ontario Royal Commissions on Taxation and on Metropolitan Toronto, and had acted as a consultant to the federal government, five provinces, several international organizations and many municipalities and school boards. In addition he had lectured at several universities in Ontario and British Columbia and had been the author of several books and numerous articles on local government issues. Gilbert said that Feldman's topic, the state of two-tier governments in metropolitan areas, was close to the heart of many of the issues that had been raised during the breakfast seminar series.

Lionel Feldman began by saying that he had recently been at a seminar at Oxford on why two- tier governments were in trouble in many parts of the world. He said he would like to relate some of the conclusions of that meeting to his own experiences in working on Metropolitan Istanbul, on local government structural reform in Greece, and on discussions on the topic within the OECD. After talking about the state of two-tier governments in a number of western countries, he would then make some remarks about the situation in the Metropolitan Toronto area.

Feldman said that the seminar at Oxford was based on the experience of ten cities including Rotterdam, Tokyo, San Francisco, Copenhagen, London, Paris, Rome and Vancouver. A book will be published in 1993 with chapters on each of the cities and overview papers by Jim Sharpe of Oxford and Peter Hall, who from his California base is still a close advisor on urban issues to Michael Heseltine, the British Minister of the Environment.

Feldman said that although there had been considerable local government restructuring around the world in large metropolitan areas, few were the subject of two-tier governments like Metropolitan Toronto. In the United States, Dade County, which encompassed Miami, had been the only "metro" and it had since changed form. There have been some other city-county partnerships in the U.S., the most effective of which were around Jacksonville, Florida, and Nashville, Tennessee. Hannover, Germany, and Dublin, Ireland were two European examples of city-county consolidations.

Feldman said that in Canada a gamut of structural innovations had been attempted. The large cities of Alberta and New Brunswick had expanded through annexations. A loose confederation of municipalities were joined together in the Greater Vancouver Regional District. He cited Winnipeg as an interesting experience where a metropolitan form of government had been replaced by today's unicity.

Feldman said that although there have not been major changes in the structure of government in large European metropolitan centres recently, there have been a number of new regional planning structures established. These have required new definitions of planning responsibilities between the central cities and the regions.

Feldman said that in several northern European countries a restructuring has taken place leading to sharp reductions in the number of municipalities. They had been reduced, for example, from 2500 to 287 in Sweden, from 24,000 to 8,000 in Germany and from 2,500 to 598 in Belgium.

The closest parallels to the Metro Toronto situation he noted were in Turkey, where Metro Toronto had been used as a model. Three cities - Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir - had metropolitan governments. The strongest was probably in Istanbul where a charismatic mayor of the metropolitan area forged a successful metropolitan government covering over 7 million people before being defeated in an election dominated by national political issues.

Feldman said that the 34 world metropolitan areas of more than 5 million population had a wide range of governing structures. While pure metropolitan forms of government were rare, there were many loose area-wide structures. They were all characterized by some degree of tension or even antagonism between the core city and the periphery.

He used the examples of Oslo and Winnipeg as two cities where the central city boundaries had been extended to cover the metropolitan area. In many cities, he said, it was difficult to define what area should be defined as the metropolis.

Among two-tier metropolitan governments he listed Barcelona, Stockholm, Belgrade, Istanbul, Tokyo, Montreal and Toronto. The upper tier functions were similar to those of Metro Toronto in most of these cities with some service areas being split between metropolitan and area municipalities and purely local functions left with the lower tier. He noted one striking shift in emphasis in recent years. Land use planning, which had at one time been seen as the sine qua non of metropolitan government responsibilities, was now giving way to an emphasis on strategic planning at the metro level.

Feldman said that in the last five years, four metropolitan governments had gone out of existence in Barcelona, Rotterdam, Copenhagen and London, while in Stockholm the metropolitan government has lost much of its former prestige. One of the chief reasons for this development has been that in each case, metropolitan governments based on the national political party system have been caught up in partisan issues.

The Barcelona metropolitan government had been abolished in large part because it was dominated by socialists while the surrounding region was right wing. The Greater London Council and six other metropolitan governments in England had been abolished in large part because they had been defying Margaret Thatcher's policy prescriptions. In the London area the 32 boroughs were now left without a regional coordination body, many local government services have been privatized and the Inner London Educational Authority has been abolished.

Feldman said that the Rotterdam metropolitan government had failed both because of partisan and intergovernmental differences. He said it had been pressured in opposite directions by the national government and the area municipalities and because it did not have the power of override on the actions of local municipalities, it lost its effectiveness. Copenhagen had a 20 year experience with metropolitan government which had come apart because of an inability to agree on landfill sites.

Feldman said that because the metropolitan region of Tokyo was so large it was difficult to make a direct comparison with Toronto. He concluded therefore, that the closest comparison with Metro was Istanbul. It has a metropolitan government with 32 area municipalities with a population of seven million and a rapid growth rate due to heavy immigration from the interior. The original mayor of Metropolitan Istanbul carried 30 local mayors to victory on his coattails. He was of the same political party as the national governing party. After the first five-year term, however, the local elections became referenda on the performance of the national parties and he was defeated. The new mayor of Metropolitan Istanbul, a Social Democrat who is a former chief administration officer of the city and a former national minister of tourism, was very surprised to be elected.

Feldman said that because no one really loves the upper tier in two-tier governments, few leaders have been prepared to take a strong stake in their success. It was necessary therefore to account for the relative success of Metro Toronto.

Feldman said that Metro came into being 37 years ago because of a crisis in the provision of services. Its first decade was a success because it dealt successfully with that crisis. From 1964 to 1988 Metro continued as a success because it was able to make a series of incremental gains without upsetting anyone. Direct election to Metro beginning in 1988 has changed the dynamic with elected councillors now devoted full time to Metro issues. For the last three years the majority of these councillors have still been testing the new mandate. The next three years will likely see a sharpening of the issues.

Feldman said that in the stirrings of an independent stance at Metro there are already omens of conflict with area municipalities, with other regions and with the OGTA as the province's representative, as Metro exercises its planning powers.

Feldman said that Metro will be forced into taking a position of leadership or it will fade as an effective level of government. He said that some people would support the position outlined by Hazel McCallion, the Mayor of Mississauga, at an earlier CUI breakfast seminar to the effect that the regional governments could be done away with leaving the provincial government, a coordinating body for the GTA and the area municipalities to handle regional responsibilities. On the other hand many of the Metro councillors seem to want the reverse - doing away with the lower tier. The dilemma is that the basic community represented by the city requires an institutional response, but so do those functions that spill over the boundaries of the lower tier.

Feldman said that in his opinion the need for region-wide land use planning had been oversold but there is a real need for region-wide strategic directions. The fact that the central business district drives the economy of the region cannot be ignored. Neither can the differences between local municipalities with rural and urban identities.

In concluding his opening presentation, Feldman made three broad points:

- First, metropolitan governments are always being squeezed from above and below.
- Second, there will always be a debate over the appropriate outer boundaries for a metropolitan region.
- Third, there is an almost inevitable tendency for increased hostility between suburban areas and upper-tier metropolitan governments (he used the conflict between the GTA vision and the plans within the York region as an example).

Feldman closed on an upbeat note by noting that there are now movements to recreate two-tier metropolitan governments in Rotterdam and Barcelona and that the two-tier municipal form of government in Madrid is working well.

Discussion

The first questioner asked why Feldman had been so selective and hadn't used successful examples from France and California or a city like Bangkok. In response Feldman said that he had restricted himself to cities that he knew personally or had sufficient data about.

Another questioner asked Feldman to comment on the impact for metropolitan government of the creation of regions in many western European countries such as Spain, Italy and France. These regions have been given responsibility for some local issues previously the exclusive domain of central governments. Feldman responded by saying that the crucial element in the potential power of these new regions is the power to tax. In Greece where regions similar to those in France are being established by the central government, progress has been stymied by the tax issue. Farmers in Greece have traditionally not paid property tax. The proposed introduction of such a tax to pay for the regions resulted in a storm of opposition.

In Italy, the legislation is in place for the financing of the regions by taxation but the political will is not. As a result, the regions have to rely on transfer payments and their power and autonomy, especially on metropolitan issues, has suffered.

A participant suggested that money would be the key issue in the determination of future forms of government in the Greater Toronto Area. He said that the City of Toronto's tax base had been used to finance infrastructure and the cost of education in the other parts of Metropolitan Toronto following Metro's establishment and he could see the same thing happening in the future between Metro and the rest of the GTA. He asked Feldman if he thought that lack of money would lead to the elimination of one of the tiers of local government.

Feldman said in reply that in the education area, financing needs had increased in part because of the decision to fund separate schools to grade thirteen. The resultant fragmentation of the education system was endangering what had been the cash cow for education - the central core revenue base. He said there was a potential danger that the GTA might move closer to the American situation where there was not enough money for any improvement in the system. The questioner said that this was being exacerbated by the lack of lateral thinking by provincial ministries. He said that rural boards of education were being required to obtain 150 acre sites for new schools - much too expensive for the system. Similarly the Metro Toronto Board of Education was being required to pay out $175 million for school access for the disabled - an amount that did not take into account the other financial demands on the system.

A participant asked Feldman if he knew of examples where strategic planning had worked at the upper tier in the absence of direct elections. He said that the region of Peel had begun developing overall strategies. He cited as an example Peel's "Home in Fifteen" program where the region was trying to link the locations of jobs and homes. Feldman said that there had not been enough experience yet with strategic planning at the regional level. He said that regional land use plans had been nibbled away by locally-oriented decisions in several areas of Ontario - e.g. the parkway belt around Toronto and the greenbelt around Ottawa. He suggested that because strategic plans can mean almost anything, perhaps we should be talking about strategic thinking at the upper tier rather than strategic planning.

Another participant asked whether there had been successful examples of strategic planning or thinking for a metropolitan region in the absence of fundamental structural reform. Feldman responded that things have worked well either when political parties in power at the region and other relevant levels of government have been the same or where there has been fundamental structural change. He said that each metropolitan region had a different set of relationships between the central city and the surrounding area. A crucial question has always been the delineation of the appropriate boundaries of the metropolis. He raised the issue of whether this has really been decided for the Greater Toronto Area.

Another participant asked where the centres of knowledge were in the world on large scale urban systems. He said there used to be work in Canada through the Canadian Council on Urban and Regional Research (CCURR) on the optimal size for metropolitan areas and on the Great Lakes megalopolis. He said that systems of government for metropolitan areas seemed to work best in western Europe where national governments were prepared to give up some of their sovereignty - up to the EEC and down to the regions and metropolitan centres. Feldman said that good work used to be done in the Technical Advisory Service of the OECD, which had unfortunately been disbanded. He said that the Council of Europe now provides consulting services on metropolitan governance issues on a contract basis to its poorer members.

Another member of the audience added that the Batelle Institute in New York City was working on the changing role of nation states and cities. He said that relevant work was also being carried out at the University of Montreal through the Institute des villes internationales. Feldman said there were also a number of individual academics working in this area.

A participant suggested that the prevailing culture in any country determines the structure of local government and its relative success. He said for example, that the wave of Thatcherite thought in Britain in the 1980s had determined the structure of government for metropolitan areas. He suggested that one of the reasons for the success of Metropolitan Toronto was that its government was non-partisan. Feldman replied that he did not see non-partisanship as a panacea. He said that in Western Canada non-partisanship had been used by the right to wage war on the left. An amalgam of Liberals, Conservatives and Social Creditors had battled the NDP under the guise of non-partisanship.

Another participant said that he did not see partisan confrontation between the levels of government in the GTA. Rather he thought that the confrontation that existed was more on economic grounds or on conflicts over the scope of responsibilities. He said that one of the strengths in the GTA is the growing consensus among municipalities over strategic goals. Feldman said he had probably overplayed ideological and partisan differences. In the UK he said much of the conflict had come about because the national government had wanted to see local government spending constrained. Prior to actually abolishing the upper tier, a number of other means had been attempted to cut back local spending. He concluded that the key question was who should be responsible for what and how do you then hold them accountable.

A participant said that this provided some ground for optimism in that local government in Ontario was the one level that still had some fiscal flexibility. He said that one of the reasons for this was that the Ontario Municipal Board had blocked many expensive capital projects. Feldman added that municipalities still had considerable unused borrowing power.

A member of the audience said that most members of the public think that they are overtaxed and over governed and that all levels of government are spoiling for turf wars. He cited the building of Metro Hall as an example of the regions flexing their muscles. He said that there is much to be done in the Toronto metropolitan area but no one is sure as to who should be doing it. He said he fears that we may not meet the urban challenge and Metro may not be able to continue its successes because of this malaise. Feldman agreed that the public is angry but doesn't know who to be angry at. He said moves to create a greater sense of empowerment will help.

We will be less likely to let challenges slip the sooner there is some form of direct election to all governments in the GTA and the sooner there is some approach to the overall governance of the entire region. It is essential to sharpen the lines of responsibility and accountability for the delivery of services. He said that the Office of the Greater Toronto Area must soon face up to the issue of accountability in the GTA. When that is done, the question will be what the future of the existing two levels of local government will be in the region.

Feldman said he did not think the structural issue would be tackled quickly. Rather he thought the emphasis would first be on economic issues, which would leave local government structural issues off the agenda for the time being. The questioner commented that the economic attractiveness of the region may depend on public confidence that local government structures work.

A participant said that governments must respect how people feel and respect their instincts about what their community is. He suggested that two developments had made things much more difficult for the GTA. First, the province had created five regions around Metropolitan Toronto in the early 1970s rather than creating a single government for what was then the Greater Toronto Area. These new regions did not fit the public perception of their own community and regional identity. Second, the new regional governments then set up their own plans and programs that were in conflict with an overall approach to the broader region. The participant asked Feldman if there was a way that respected political sensitivities to undo what had happened in the early 1970s.
In response, Feldman said that it had been too easy for the provincial government in the early 1970s to use the counties as the basis for the new regional governments. He said there is a low public understanding of patterns of human settlements and therefore it is difficult to devise appropriate forms of local government. He suggested that the current provincial boundaries are equally illogical and often irrelevant to real patterns of activity. He said that wherever possible we should be building plans, programs and structures around patterns of urban activity.

4 Local Heroes: Customers in the GTA

Presentation by David Weinberg, President, CIBC Development Corporation, October 11, 1991

Richard Gilbert introduced David Weinberg by noting that he was both an architect and a planner. He had been a planner with the City of Toronto and program manager for the elaboration of the Downtown Area Plan. After it had formally been put in place he moved, in 1979, to the private sector with Cadillac-Fairview where he became its Vice-President of Development in 1980. In 1989 he became President of the CIBC Development Corporation and Executive Vice-President, Administrative Bank, CIBC.

David Weinberg made the following remarks:

Almost 20 years ago, Fortune magazine extolled Toronto as "the world's newest great city". Toronto earned this accolade by stirring the enthusiasm of three key constituencies: residents, business and tourists. The same issue included a photograph of CIBC's newly built Commerce Court, a building which Fortune terms "a big hit".

How have Toronto and Commerce Court fared in the intervening years? Time has scarred both.

The Greater Toronto Area is now home to almost four million people, almost twice the population in the early '70s. The city's infrastructure is bending under this tremendous weight.

Commerce Court, while built with quality and classic materials, has deficiencies compared to newer building. Two decades ago, the complex designed by I. M. Pei was considered state-of-the-art. Today, it lacks the energy conversion features and security systems which are common to the modern office tower. And the design of the building's retail facilities is uninspired compared to that of newer complexes.

So the GTA and Commerce Court are in similar straits. Without measures to revitalize and renew the GTA's infrastructure, Toronto will sink to the status of a second-tier city. Likewise, without improvements, Commerce Court will lose tenants to newer buildings and slip to class B status.

While the GTA appears strapped for solutions, CIBC has been quicker to act. This morning I want to share with you the philosophy behind our effort to ensure the Commerce Court remains a viable to vital complex. I believe this philosophy can be applied with equal effectiveness to the GTA.

The key is to recognize that we all have customers. For CIBC Development Corporation, our customers are our tenants. The GTA's customers are its residents, tourists and business. Yet business is most often overlooked.

Rather than viewing developers and business as local heroes who provide economic benefits to the community, government's relationship with this constituency is often tinged with antagonism. And, instead of creating the best possible climate for commerce, government may be driving business away.

Obviously, the issues facing the GTA are bigger in scale and far more complex. Although the consequences of letting the quality of the city's infrastructure deteriorate are not as immediate, nonetheless there are some important parallels between Commerce Court and the GTA.

The recession and the glut of office space in Toronto are teaching developers that they no longer have the upper hand when it comes to dealing with tenants. Like other industries that have been forced to compete vigorously for customers, developers are beginning to embrace the service quality ethic. At CIBC, our aim is to make tenants always feel valued, not only at lease renewal time.

To meet our tenants' expectations for a high quality office environment and to ensure that Commerce Court continues to serve as a premier office address. CIBC has committed $310 million for renovations - nearly as much as we spent in the early '70s to build the complex. The decision to renovate Commerce Court was not an easy one. With a vacancy rate of almost 15 per cent, the city has never had more empty office space. Tenants are also reducing the amount of space that they lease by consolidating operations. Furthermore, the expenditures will not directly increase CIBC's return on the building. As a long-term service quality decision however, it makes eminent sense. The renovations will fully meet the expectations of our tenants for prime office space and save Commerce Court from obsolescence.

We have also rationalized CIBC's realty functions to improve efficiency. Until recently, responsibility for property matters was dispersed across several departments and regions of CIBC. This situation created inefficiency, rivalry and duplication. That responsibility is now solely with CIBC Development Corporation. Our tenants don't have to wade through multiple layers and channels of bureaucracy. Service is quick and convenient. In short, to remain competitive, we are becoming more responsive to the needs of our customers.

How responsive is the GTA to its customers? Let's take a look.

For years, Toronto was recognized as "the city that works". Now it's showing signs of rust. The GTA's population has grown by more than one million people in less than 20 years, but major infrastructure projects have not kept pace.

The speed of population growth for the GTA is expected to gallop along at a rate of more than two million people over the next 20 years. Sixty per cent of this surge is expected to result from the natural growth of the existing population. Without large-scale improvements and development, Toronto will simply become a more congested copy of itself in the future.

The consequences of neglect are costly. Several months ago, I participated in a panel with Gardner Church, the deputy minister in the office for the GTA. He said that if Toronto's growth continues at its current pace, the city could generate approximately $3 trillion in economic activity over the next two decades. Without an improved infrastructure, however, Toronto will stagnate. We could, Mr. Church suggested, resemble a Third World city with a soaring population and no economic growth. An extreme scenario to be sure. But there are other examples that are closer to home.

Several cities have proven how easy it is to slide into second tier status. Detroit was once a model for Lyndon Johnson's "great society". In just over 40 years, however, Detroit has lost much of its population as well as its position as one of the strongest economic centres in North America.

Even London, England, is showing signs of strain and its preeminence as a financial centre may be greatly diminished. One British business association estimates that London's transport problems are costing Can. $19.6 billion a year in lost time and opportunities. A recent survey by the London Chamber of Commerce found that infrastructural weakness may be causing foreign banks to leave for Paris and Frankfurt. The Chamber's survey of more than 100 banks doing business in the United Kingdom found that London was not taking steps needed to retain financial institutions.

So you see, deterioration can happen to any city. An it can happen quickly. If Toronto is to avoid a similar fate, it must improve its infrastructure. The 1990 Urban Structures Concepts Study is a good start. It lays out three models for future urban development. The first shows growth dispersed throughout the GTA, much like Los Angeles. The second model has economic and population growth concentrated in the Metropolitan Toronto core, much like many European cities. The third is a network of compact centres of commerce and housing surrounding a strong core in the City of Toronto. The ideas for infrastructure renewal are there. So is the urgency to get things done. Let's be clear however, as to who will pay for them. Whatever model is approved, it will cost a substantial sum.

The Office for the GTA estimates it will require approximately $80 billion over 25 years to support each of the three models. While there are many aspects to the issue, ultimately infrastructure renewal boils down to a question of affordability.

The GTA can choose from a number of financing options. One of them is the "let's make a deal" approach whereby developers are allowed to build high density structures in exchange for providing public services. I am a firm believer in alliances between the public and private sectors, but I take a dim view of this kind of trade-off. Here's why.

Toronto's Central Area Plan has been the city's official plan since 1976. It was initially intended to be a temporary pause in downtown development while the government determined the facilities necessary to support the downtown core.

By making specific deals and providing density bonuses, the city has allowed patchy, piecemeal downtown office development to proceed in return for daycare centres and other social services - without concern for providing transit or road improvements. The result has been higher density with no additional infrastructure to support it - a situation that further aggravates the city's problems. Nor do these trade-offs necessarily provide the public benefits that are most urgently needed.

I see backroom deals between government and developers as something like door-to-door sales. I recently had a salesperson come to my house peddling windows. Until I got a knock on the door, I never thought about having them replaced.

Government, I think is in a similar situation. Before the developer came calling, building a daycare centre was not foremost on the government's list of priorities. And even if the service was necessary, the person making the pitch was often not the best qualified to provide it.

Another impractical alternative is higher realty taxes. Although it's easy, I don't believe increasing taxes is the answer to funding infrastructural renewal. Commercial realty taxes should, indeed, generate much of the needed revenue. As a sector that reaps the advantages of a tax affluent local market, business must assume its fair share of the tax burden. We have a responsibility to pay the taxes that make public infrastructure and services possible.

Unfortunately, current tax levels severely penalize Metro business and may even drive business away. Our realty tax levels are among the highest in the world - and that makes me wonder whether GTA stands for the "greater taxation area". In prime downtown Toronto buildings, total taxes increased from about $6 per square foot in 1985 to $10 per square foot in 1990. That's almost 50 percent in five years. Realty taxes for a business operating in downtown Toronto are US $8.32 per square foot, higher even than mid-town Manhattan where the rate is US $8.00.

The difference between Toronto and the central business districts of some other major North American cities is even greater. Downtown Manhattan's 1991 realty taxes are US $6.75 per square foot. Chicago's are US $5.48 per square foot. Washington, with its newly built subway system, has realty taxes of just US $5.00 per square foot. Los Angeles is at US $2.33 per square foot and Atlanta as low as US $2.14 per square foot.

In short, Toronto's realty taxes are the highest in North America and fourth highest in the world after London, Tokyo and Glasgow. Market value assessment, which is likely to be introduced in 1993, could tack on another two to six dollars per square foot to downtown Toronto's commercial realty taxes. But that's not all. Proposals for the city's new official plan include additional levies. Developers could be taxed about $10 for every square foot of commercial space that they build.

How would developers recoup this additional capital expense? By charging it back to the customer, of course. The $10 per square foot charge would likely translate to a $1 per square foot increase to tenants during the initial lease.

The creators of the plan believe that because new commercial development creates jobs and an additional demand for housing, developers should pay for the housing. I believe additional taxes will have opposite consequences - they will discourage future development in the city, and when commercial property tax bills go up more quickly than the rate of inflation, businesses will start to compare Toronto with other locations and ask what they are getting in return.

Businesses are already questioning why they should pay such high taxes. Some Canadians, like the residents of Blenheim, Ontario are not taking it any more. This past July, Blenheim declared itself an independent, tax-free republic. One may be tempted to dismiss Blenheim as a mouse that roared, but the town has garnered a huge amount of interest and support. The taxpayers coalition, organized by one of the local business owners, has expanded across 63 Ontario municipalities. Its purpose is to force politicians at the municipal level to reduce taxes. A brewing tax revolt is one response to rising taxes. The other is a potential exodus from Toronto. A trend away from expensive urban centres has already taken root in the United States. The suburbs have become a formidably competitor even for the Big Apple.

In 1987, the Mobil Corporation, one of America's largest industrial companies, moved from New York City to Fairfax County in rural Virginia. J. C. Penny, the clothing retailer, moved its headquarters to suburban Dallas, and New York's four leading commodity markets came close to moving across the river to New Jersey. With them would have gone US $1.3 billion in annual economic activity, $165 million in tax revenues and 12,000 jobs. To keep them on Wall Street, the New York City government had to provide a $145 million incentive. The reasons these organization give for leaving have a familiar ring: high rents and high taxes.

We're seeing similar trends in Toronto. Trans-Canada Pipelines moved its head office from Toronto to Calgary. Crown Life is headed for Regina. Several major accounting and law firms are opening satellite offices outside the downtown Toronto area. Ontario Hydro is locating in North York. This flight to the suburbs, or other cities, is symptomatic of the exorbitant cost of operating an office in Toronto's downtown core.

So Toronto finds itself on the horns of a very difficult dilemma. My view is that the government must work with the business sector to promote appropriate urban improvement in the most efficient and cost-effective manner. The Toronto region generates some 20 per cent of Canada's national income. In addition, GTA residents contribute 50 per cent of the total income tax paid by Ontarians to the federal and provincial governments. Without a strong business sector, these revenues would be nowhere near as high.

Yet business in the GTA may suffer the same fate as the goose that lays eggs of gold. The greedy farmer decides if he kills the goose, he will become rich by taking all of the eggs at once instead of one at a time. The killed bird, of course, lays no more eggs.

To avoid strangling the golden goose, the GTA must view business much the way CIBC Development Corporation regards its tenants - as valued customers that must be wooed and retained by improving the city's infrastructure and providing exceptional service. If the GTA becomes more hospitable to business, it will be in a better position to afford improvements because there is a larger base to build from. By the same token, if customers are leaving, the cost of infrastructure improvement will be prohibitive.

Cities south of the border have the right idea. During the past several months, delegations from the United States have arrived in Canada to entice business into relocating in their community. With the promise of financing and tax incentives, American states have attracted dozens of Canadian businesses.

Perhaps the best example of a city marketing itself is Atlanta. Twenty-year tax breaks are available to companies which locate in city-owned industrial parks and municipal agencies help businesses cut through red tape. The city has built a first class international airport and provided affordable housing and state-of-the-art rapid transit. According to a vice-president of Atlanta-based Coca-Cola, "the key to Atlanta's vitality has been a strong, mutually beneficial relationship between the public and private sectors".

Toronto may not want to adopt the same strong, pro-business stance of Atlanta. And I don't believe that we should become just like any American city. I'm personally willing to pay more to stay in Toronto because we have better social services, among other benefits. But I think it's possible to adopt some of Atlanta's strong points and not inherit the problems that afflict some cities in the U.S.

If you look at our city's diversified economy, its educated and skilled labour force, its high quality of life, Toronto has much in its favour. By big city standards, our problems are decidedly small-scale and relatively surmountable.

An effective way of improving the city's efficiency is by better coordinating the government's various activities. I indicated earlier that CIBC streamlined its organizational structure so that only one area is responsible for dealing with tenants. The result is a flatter organization that provides customers with better service at a lower administrative cost. Similar results are possible for the GTA.

There are no fewer than four levels of government and three autonomous bodies governing the GTA, including the Toronto Harbour Commission, Harbourfront and the Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority. For developers and businesses operating in the GTA, the layers have been a source of frustration. They not only represent enormous bureaucratic hurdles that have to be cleared, but they often work at cross purposes. Look at the Spadina subway line. One group puts in the subway and

the local municipality will not rezone the area close to it. So when the subway line went in, growth stopped.

Consider waterfront development in Toronto. In the 1970s when the federal government established Harbourfront, the aim was to sell off or lease waterfront land for private development and use the proceeds to finance new facilities along with cultural and recreational programs.

Then in the 1980s, the provincial government became concerned with the nature of development that was taking place and decided to freeze development on the central waterfront. Developers who had purchased or leased land suddenly found they couldn't build on it. So while the federal government took steps to encourage development, the provincial government turned around and put a stop to it.

There is confusion in government and this leads to confusion in planning. We need greater coordination and consistency in how the GTA is governed. What makes the most sense is to make the GTA an arm of the provincial government that would set broad policy. The local government could operate within that. In effect, several layers would be collapsed into two.

By the way, the cost savings of such a move would be enormous. A survey done by the Ontario Urban Development Institute found that the GTA's various planning departments spend almost $65 million in consulting fees. With fewer jurisdictions, we could potentially reduce these amounts by half.

When David Cooke, Ontario's Minister of Municipal Affairs, spoke to this group in September, he indicated that one of his priorities would be disentanglement - a simpler form of government. I asked him if this meant rationalization. Mr. Cooke suggested this would lead to a turf war of sorts and in the end, not much would be accomplished.

I know from my own experience at CIBC Development Corporation that rationalizing a large organization is easier said than done. The decision to centralize the realty function was met with some resistance. We had to prove to other areas of CIBC that we could provide better service at a lower cost. So Mr. Cooke's point is a valid one. But if we don't tackle the issue and try to streamline government, we will never solve the problem.

At the very least, we must put aside specific local agendas for a broad vision of how the GTA should evolve. We all want a city that works - socially, environmentally and economically. Let's use this as a starting point to create the ideal that Jane Jacobs writes about. In her classic book, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, she suggests that urban success is a "most intricate and close-grained diversity of uses that give each other constant mutual support both economically and socially".

Business is one of those essential ingredients which governments must nurture, before it's too late.

Discussion

The first questioner asked Weinberg for his views on public-private sector collaboration in financing infrastructure, using the proposed Sheppard subway line as an example. Weinberg replied that he was not enamoured of the private sector paying directly for public infrastructure. From a pure business viewpoint, such investments are expensive and risky. From a broader perspective, public infrastructure benefits are almost always spread over a large area, and all those who benefit should pay their share. This means that part of the cost should come from tax revenues at each level of government and possibly from a special levy on properties that gain very direct benefits. In this way, government would take the initial big risk, but would gradually receive a payback. He said that in some cities the private sector has initiated infrastructure spending which has later been taken over by the public sector. Public transit in Boston, for example, benefited by the purchase of a number of private tram lines. He said that private developers have tried to come to an agreement on building the Sheppard subway line but the sharing of appropriate costs and benefits is extremely difficult to measure. Because of the obligations of private firms to their shareholders, the public sector normally ends up taking most of the risk on public-private collaborative projects.

A questioner asked what the infrastructure problem was in Toronto and what should be done about it. Weinberg replied that while the Yonge subway was overloaded, a bigger problem was that people who worked downtown could not afford to live downtown. He said that if the nodal vision of the GTA was pursued with gusto, it could result in a much better matching of jobs with residences, and with traffic going in both directions on the subways.

He added that CIBC had been stalled for over four years in the approvals process in North York for a development that would assist in easing the one-way load on the subway system. It would be essential to develop the infrastructure for both residential and commercial development in the GTA nodes.

A participant asked if Weinberg's comment on the Sheppard subway issue meant that he favoured earmarked taxation for specific projects. Weinberg replied that business is not averse to paying taxes for services that can be better provided by the public sector as long as it believes it is being treated fairly. He said that if there were more direct relationships between the cost of a facility or service and the taxation to pay for it, it would be easier to understand and evaluate whether value for money was being obtained.

A member of the audience noted that other statements from CIBC representatives have painted a far less optimistic picture of our economic prospects for the next decade than Weinberg. He asked what would likely happen to the GTA in a no-growth scenario. Weinberg said he had been using GTA projections which may have been too optimistic, but he does not believe the Toronto area will stop growing, although if Canada were to break apart there would be serious problems.

If there were slower economic growth, population growth would likely continue because of immigration although office development would not grow as fast. He reminded the audience that Toronto has had no major infrastructure expenditures and no new subways for twenty years. Other cities around the world, like London, England, were now embarking on new rapid transit projects.

The questioner replied that population growth without economic growth does not create the wealth needed to finance major infrastructure. He expressed concern that the lack of money would create a situation of political paralysis regarding public investment decisions for the future. Weinberg replied that he did not believe the region will become poorer. After the recession there may be fewer businesses but necessary restructuring may make them more profitable. He said that the solutions will depend on operating governments more efficiently and spending more wisely the revenues from reasonable levels of taxation. He likened the task of government to that of CIBC with Commerce Court: spending in the interests of the long term even when rents are going down. It is essential to decide on what infrastructure is really needed and then to invest in it. He said this might be easier for the Ontario Government if it were to separate its operating budget from its capital budget the way the private sector does.

A questioner asked if it were possible to make the tax system more strategic to encourage land use planning objectives like more concentrated development. Weinberg said that it might be useful to emulate the system in South Africa where vacant land is taxed at market value as if it were developed. This would be a disincentive to hold vacant land and a disincentive to rezone land for development before it is needed.

A participant said that there is little input from the business or developer community in the evolution of public policy. He asked Weinberg for his views on how this could best be achieved. Weinberg said that while he agreed that business should play a more active role in policy-making, he was at a loss as to the best way. He noted that the Urban Development Institute (UDI) and the Canada Institute of Public Real Estate Companies (CIPREC) had got together to respond to City Plan 91. Weinberg had tried to get tenants and other organizations involved in the preparation of the submission, but the organizational task was so difficult that in the end, even UDI and CIPREC were not able to make a joint submission. One of the problems is that Toronto City Council has tended to take a short-run and political view to development issues. To change the face of the city, vision is needed like that of Fred Gardiner for example, who was responsible for much of Metro's infrastructure, or that of the builders of the Bloor Street viaduct who provided for a subway half a century in advance. Weinberg said the current planning process tends to put developers against communities with the result that politicians listen more to the groups representing voters.

A participant raised the point that a new set of environmental approvals is being added to an already contorted approvals process. He asked whether Weinberg believed the Sewell Commission would be likely to improve the situation.

Weinberg said that he was optimistic. He said that Sewell appreciates the difficulties of the process but that he wants better development. Weinberg said he had spoken to Sewell about the red tape now blocking main street intensification. He said it was essential that a simpler planning approvals process be put in place. He was not as optimistic that the views of developers will have much of an impact on the Commission.

A questioner asked why the City of Toronto needed 100 planners when the City of North York with almost the same population had only 10 planners. Weinberg said that Toronto's planning staff had got into many non-planning areas and that it was enormously difficult to get anything approved in the City of Toronto. He said, as an example, that he had obtained general acceptance for the state-of-the-art concept of Commerce Court North which the Toronto Historical Board had strongly approved. There was then a long debate over esoteric design issues with city planners, who held up the final approval for months. Weinberg added that the City Planning Department used to deal only with issues for which it had direct responsibility.

A participant suggested that one of the real problems was the self-serving nature of the private sector. He said that although the real decision-making centres for development and infrastructure were at the regional and Metro levels, corporate interests had been pouring money into the Toronto mayoralty race (a participant noted that the Mayor of Toronto could stop things). He added that the only intervention of the Metro Board of Trade on development issues at Metro Council last year had been an unimpressive submission on an aspect of waste disposal. The private sector generally had not given much constructive support to Metro Council.

Weinberg said that he did not want to imply that all private sector companies were constructive but that many were. He said that the focus of private sector interventions was not just on the City of Toronto. He said there was a need for laws to regulate the excesses of some private sector companies out for a fast buck. But he stressed that governments must get their act together. Decisions must be taken on issues like the Sheppard subway. He suggested that government efficiency would be serviced by abolishing Metro and the regions and establishing a body with real coordinating power at the GTA.

It was noted by a participant that Metro Council had spent a whole day that week on infrastructure issues but that there had been no business involvement. Weinberg said that it was necessary to have a body that could organize private sector views around specific issues. He thought it was possible to organize constructive consortia of developers, banks, tenants and retail interests. He said there was now an unhealthy feeling of alienation in much of the business sector and a concern that business will not be listened to by governments. In the Fred Gardiner era it was easy, perhaps too easy, for the private sector, but the pendulum has now swung too far in the opposite direction. In Mexico, approval can be obtained for a new hotel in an hour and a half.

A participant said that the private sector is always complaining about taxes. He suggested that one of the reasons for increases in local taxes was that income taxes on high income earners have been decreasing. He asked what overall importance the real estate tax load has on business development in Toronto. Weinberg replied that in tough economic times, companies have been trying to reduce their overheads. They have succeeded in many areas they can control, but they cannot control tax levels, which have been rising more rapidly than their other costs. Taxes can now amount to as much as 25 per cent of the cost of a new development. Tenants have become resistant to rents which have escalated because of rising taxes and business does not believe it has enough of a say in how tax revenues are spent.

A questioner said that the City of Toronto has created a new levy to encourage more residential development in downtown Toronto. He asked Weinberg how best to encourage more housing in the downtown area. Weinberg said this proposal has come from the "let's make a deal" philosophy and that the new levy has to result in higher land costs or higher rents. He said that the best way to encourage residential development would be to rezone the King-Parliament and King-Spadina areas for housing. He said that in spite of the views of some city planners, new industry cannot be attracted into these areas. Weinberg said that if these areas were rezoned, the private sector would build housing there - likely cheaper than Ataritiri.

A participant said that Weinberg's appeal to government to develop a consistent approach in the GTA just as CIBC was doing was inappropriate. Government cannot be compared to a single private corporation. He said that we live in a federal country with a complex system with many competing interests to reconcile. He noted that many US cities do not work well because of complex government systems. He said we need to think through how people can be best represented in making decisions on infrastructure. Weinberg admitted that there were obvious differences between the private and public sectors, but he was talking about the advantages of simplifying structures within government, as CIBC had consolidated its real estate, financing and development departments. He said all businesses were trying to flatten out their organizations and cut out layers of bureaucracy.

He said there was a real problem with the number of layers of government and that paralysis would be engendered by trying to represent everyone.

Weinberg was asked for his views on the optimum number of government layers in the GTA and how he thought strategic issues could be best dealt with. Weinberg responded by saying that the GTA corresponds to Metro of forty years ago. He said we should avoid creating a new layer of government; rather we should eliminate Metro and the regions. He then suggested that the GTA responsibilities be handled as a separate provincial body, the level of government with the money. When he was asked if this would not in effect create another province, he said that since we may lose one province, we will probably need another.

5 How to be Mayor of Toronto

Presentation by Art Eggleton, Mayor of Toronto, October 25, 1991

Richard Gilbert welcomed Mayor Eggleton to the breakfast seminar. Gilbert said that when he himself had come to City Hall 16 years ago, Art Eggleton was already a veteran councillor. He had been the youngest member of council and then Toronto's longest serving mayor. In 1991 Eggleton is probably the most well-known person in Toronto in spite of his natural modesty. Gilbert said that what may not be as well known in Toronto is how well known and respected Mayor Eggleton is around the world, by his fellow mayors, by international organizations and by those concerned with good municipal management and environmental preservation. He said the mayor had been given the topic "How to be Mayor of Toronto" as an opportunity for him to reflect on his years in office.

Mayor Eggleton began his remarks by saying that he felt very much a part of the Canadian Urban Institute having helped create it. He said he believed the CUI could do great things by promoting the transfer of knowledge between different groups and between cities. He said that one of Toronto's service export industries can be its experiences of urban management and development.

He expressed his appreciation to the Canadian Urban Institute for its work in the organization of the World Cities and their Environment Conference in August. That conference brought together leaders from 135 cities who produced a 26 point declaration which will go to the United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development in Brazil in 1992. The mayors and other representatives at the conference have now taken back to their own cities a range of approaches and examples to use in tackling environmental issues at the local level. He urged the CUI and the city to follow up on the conference and monitor the implementation of its recommendations.

Mayor Eggleton said that it had been an honour to serve for 22 years on Toronto City Council. His term in office ends following a 2 1/2 week transition period after the municipal elections. He said he is looking forward to a new career and is now assessing various options.

He said many people have been speculating on what differences there would be in the civic management of Toronto under Mayor Rowlands or Mayor Layton. The reality will be very different from the advance perceptions. The reports in the media have often focused on conflicts and personalities rather than a deeper analysis of the issues. Simplistic labels have been attached by the media to the candidates. Eggleton said that a mayor of Toronto cannot operate ideologically. June Rowlands was a moderate on council, not a right winger. Jack Layton has often dealt constructively with developers to obtain settlements on specific issues.

Mayor Eggleton said that the office of the mayor molds the person, just as the person can help shape the office. He said he had thought he knew everything about city council after having served as a councillor and as deputy mayor but the switch to actually being mayor was a quantum leap. The public expectations of the mayor are far greater than the mayor's actual power, since he has just one vote on council. Nevertheless, Eggleton said he was proud of his accomplishment of having council votes go his way over 80 per cent of the time. This required leadership in forming majorities issue by issue.

He said the mayor did have certain advantages by virtue of being chief executive officer of the city and getting a solid information flow from the bureaucracy. Even though the department heads technically report to council, they have a special link to the mayor. He said it was vital for the mayor and council members to develop good links with the department heads. For the mayor, it counterbalances the fact that he has just one vote on council.

Eggleton said that much of the success of a mayor depends on where he positions himself on council. He said he had emulated David Crombie by heading for the centre on most issues. To get things through, the mayor has to deal with all sides of issues as represented by council members. He said that this has been more difficult in the last three years because the city has had the most polarized council he has seen. He attributed this partly to the direct election to Metro council of some good moderates and also to the formal party organization of the NDP on council.

Mayor Eggleton said that the mayor's job was a demanding one, requiring long hours. He divided his responsibilities into four categories; the ceremonial, the political leadership function, the chairing of council and the role of chief executive officer (which he said required some additional tasks because Toronto did not have a chief administrative officer system).

He said that in Toronto there is a heavy social and ceremonial schedule, with countless organizations requesting the mayor's presence to honour special occasions. Two people on his staff do nothing but review invitations and schedule such events. He said he only accepts about 10 per cent of the invitations he receives, but this still involves him in twice as many events as most mayors. While he often sends substitutes, many events require the formal presence of the mayor.

Mayor Eggleton illustrated this aspect of his job by saying that Prince Charles had asked him the previous day at an informal reception where his chain of office was. He had to explain that he only wore it on formal occasions, unlike the lord mayors in the United Kingdom whose chief role was ceremonial and who wore the chains of office for all occasions. Eggleton said that Mayor Camilien Houde of Montreal had told King George the Sixth in 1939 that he was not wearing his chain of office for the royal visit because "I only wear it on important occasions".

The mayor said that the chairing of council was a difficult task (and one he won't miss) because in legislative terms, it was like being speaker and prime minister at the same time. It is hard to maintain an image of fairness when you are advocating a position on an issue and then at the same time having to act as arbiter, or, as he said, being both the orchestra leader and player of instruments simultaneously. He said the key to the chairmanship role lay in being well prepared. If the mayor is not a step ahead of the council, he will be eaten alive.

Mayor Eggleton reiterated his view that the CEO role depended on the maintenance of a good relationship with department heads. In this role he said he was greatly helped by the committee of heads of departments, although the mayor had to act alone on many difficult personnel issues. In the end, the buck stops at the mayor's chair.

He said the CEO role also meant that he had a different role vis-a-vis the media than he did when he was a councillor. He had now to be much more careful in what he said because the mayor has to answer to the public for what happens in the municipal corporation.

The mayor said that his political leadership role sometimes extends beyond the city council. The public had not figured out the division of responsibilities between what Metro and the city do and so it often expects the mayor to fix problems with the TTC or the police. He said that a leadership role on issues that are not formally city responsibilities is legitimate for the mayor who must be concerned with the overall health and vitality of the city. The mayor must be an advocate of a well-managed and healthy city and raise public aspirations about its future.

In closing, Mayor Eggleton said he hopes the new mayor will work an 80 hour week as he had, which had not allowed him to take a full two-week vacation in eleven years. He was now looking forward to doing other things, and read something besides city hall papers.

Discussion

The discussion opened with a questioner asking why the mayor had not mentioned his role on Metro council, and then asking what the mayor's perception was of this role.

Mayor Eggleton said the situation between Metro and the city has changed considerably since 1980. In chairman Godfrey's era, Metro was a confederation, with the six mayors being the most powerful voices on Metro council. In 1991 the mayors are outcasts - away down the totem pole of power on Metro council. He said he had touted direct election to Metro because he believed there needed to be more focus on Metro-wide issues, which he regretted has not yet happened to a sufficient extent. He said that there needed to be more accountability for Metro issues, and the new system provides that.

On the other hand, he regretted that there may now be too much separation between the two levels of municipal government. There is too much onus on the mayors as the only link between Metro and city governments. More links are needed.

The mayor said that Metro is now trying to carve out and advertise its own role. This may lead to new conflicts, especially in areas like land-use planning. For the first time, fights have developed between the city and Metro over tax levies. On reflection, Mayor Eggleton said the best governing combination may have been the system in force just before 1988 when councillors were elected to City and Metro councils at the same time.

Mayor Eggleton said the question of the governance of the Greater Toronto Area is now facing us. The set of issues that led to the creation of Metro Toronto in 1953 is back in a new form. While the creation of the Office of the Greater Toronto Area has been useful, there must be an attempt to rationalize government in the GTA. He said he was not pushing overall amalgamation but he was a supporter of a commission on governance in the region.

A participant noted that the mayor had not mentioned education in his remarks. He said that because the city had not paid enough attention to links with the Board of Education, conflicts had developed over new schools and other planning and financing issues. More recently some joint mechanisms have been established and a potential confrontation between the city and the board before the OMB has been averted.

A questioner asked why Toronto did not have a chief administrative officer, speculating that this may result in more complex processes. In reply the mayor said the system works now, and he does not see a need to fix it. He added that the current processes have been created by council which was probably the first in Canada to have full-time councillors.

A participant asked the mayor to comment on the importance he attaches to his international activities. Mayor Eggleton responded that this was becoming increasingly important and in recognition the city had recently established an international office. He said that in addition to learning much about how other cities are run, he has learned how influential Toronto can be in the international arena. He is treated like a head of state on his international visits, partly because influential people all over the world have relatives in this city. He said Toronto should use this international recognition to our own advantage. Twinning arrangements should include a business component. International activities should be carried out in collaboration with other cities and with the provincial and federal governments in order to gain maximum benefits. He cited as an example the Canadian festival in Hong Kong to which both Montreal and Toronto sent fashion designers, and which was followed up by Hong Kong visits to Montreal and Toronto.

The mayor was asked whether he believed in the value of civic parties in municipal politics, as is the custom in Quebec. He reiterated his opposition to municipal slates of the national or provincial parties which he said would increase the adversarial nature of the council. On the other hand, he said there were advantages to the organization of teams of municipal candidates as in British Columbia, mentioning that he had first been elected to council in 1969 as part of the CIVAC slate, along with David Crombie. In that election the Liberals ran a number of candidates, electing two.

The mayor justified his position that provincial parties do not lend themselves to local issues by noting that the two Liberals elected in 1969 seldom voted together, with Hugh Bruce normally supporting pro-development positions and Bill Kilbourn normally against. Similarly the mayor said that the NDP members on the current council are often split. Another problem with party politics in the current situation is that the NDP members on council have sometimes been reluctant to criticize the provincial government because their party is in power. The mayor said he thought that the NDP might have been able to elect some of its current councillors even without the formal party label. Returning to his original theme, the mayor said there should be electoral teams built around common positions on civic issues in order to build a greater degree of accountability into the system.

The mayor then excused himself for having to leave the session before its conclusion in order to greet Prince Charles and Princess Diana in front of City Hall. Don Stevenson of the Canadian Urban Institute thanked the mayor for his frankness in addressing the issues, for his support for the CUI and for having included the breakfast session among the ten per cent of invitations he accepted. He wished the mayor well in his future activities and invited him to continue to make a constructive contribution to the debate on the future of the Greater Toronto Area, perhaps through Institute programs. Stevenson then said that the discussion could continue with the mayor's executive assistant, Jeff Evenson, the executive director of Management Services, Art Stevenson, or the Commissioner of Public Works and the Environment, Nick Vardin.

Art Stevenson, Executive Director of Management Services and chair of the committee of Heads of Departments of the city, then elaborated on the mayor's answer about Toronto's lack of a CAO. He said that Toronto has been trying to achieve the advantages of a CAO system through a committee of heads of departments. This committee has managed to get the various department heads thinking corporately. It has been producing annual blueprints on city issues. It has recently organized round tables among city staff from different departments and levels in the organization on corporate directions, on human resources management and on the environment, which have been parts of the annual blueprint exercise.

Richard Gilbert said that the roles of the mayor and city council of Toronto have been inflated by the media to the point that people in Scarborough or outside of the region think of Art Eggleton as the Mayor of Metropolitan Toronto.

He suggested that there may be a let down after the new mayor is elected and some rethinking will be needed about Toronto's role in the region. Can it still be first among equals if it is surpassed in population by Mississauga? How can a new mayor sustain the leading role? Nick Vardin replied that the very name Toronto gives the city a big advantage in playing a leading role. He added that the diversity and experience represented in its fourteen departments and the support that has come from city council for good management should allow it to maintain a leading role regardless of who the mayor may be.

Art Stevenson added that Toronto's role has to be looked at in the context of the GTA as a whole. He suggested that the financing of GTA infrastructure and the future role of regional governments would be big issues. He said there was considerable disappointment at the inward- looking direction of Metro's strategic plan and the continuing local perspective of many members of Metro council. He added that it will be necessary to look at boundaries and structures in the GTA. While there will always be a role for local governments, there needs to be a new look at the roles of regional governments within the GTA.

Richard Gilbert responded that Metro's strategic plan was an internal work plan that had not been well presented. He went on to say that he thought some 28 out of the 30 local governments within the GTA had been functioning well but that the regional governments had been running into difficulty. Their roles will have to be reviewed. He noted that this view had been put forward in previous CUI breakfast sessions by Hazel McCallion and David Weinberg and had recently been the subject of an editorial in the Toronto Star. The Ontario government had made a mistake in the early 1970s by creating four regional governments around Metro Toronto rather than one regional government for the GTA. He suggested that there should be a review of the appropriate boundaries and structure of government in the GTA.

A participant asked Gilbert how a power struggle could be avoided between the province and a super-Metro covering the GTA. In response, Gilbert said that Winnipeg accounted for more than 50 per cent of the population of Manitoba while the GTA would cover close to 40 per cent of the population of Ontario. He referred to the period between 1834 and 1915 when the budget of the city of Toronto was larger than that of the province of Ontario. He said that the province has always had the legislative power to override any actions of local government but that it had not always used its power in the most effective manner. At present the local government structure works against the logical development of the GTA.

A participant asked the city of Toronto representatives if there was a concern among the members of the bureaucracy in Toronto that the bureaucracy may be too large in the city and the other local governments in the GTA. He added that the public believes there is too much government in the region.

Art Stevenson responded that there has been a significant increase in city staff in the last seven or eight years which was a period of unprecedented growth in the city. He said that all indications are that the public has been happy with the level of services provided by the city. In the next few years there will be much more constraint. He said that when Metro staff move to the new Metro Hall there will be a consolidation of almost all city departments in City Hall and a possible annex to it. Nick Vardin added that council has approved the purchase of space immediately behind city hall for such a possible annex, which should bring increased efficiencies and saving.

A questioner asked to hear what the likely options were for the balance of power and interactions in the next city council. Jeff Evenson responded that as someone trained in political science he knew that the value of predictions in this area was about zero. He said he believed that a crucial element will be the role the new mayor chooses to play, keeping in mind that the office will tend to mold the mayor. He said that the balance of power will depend on how many councillors the NDP elects and how formal the NDP platform is. He said there will be resistance on the part of non-NDP council members to any attempt to adopt a formal three-year plan with an implementation schedule. City programs have always developed incrementally in the past. Evenson said that regardless of the new personalities and attitudes of the new council, fiscal restraints will act as a brake on major changes.

A participant said that some of the charges of over government were due to the red tape caused by a myriad of recent provincial initiatives. He cited environmental regulations and pay equity as two areas that have multiplied bureaucratic procedures.

Another participant said that all the governments in the GTA have gone through a number of recent shocks such as the recession, the constitutional breakdown and the election of the NDP government. He said that these have had an adverse effect on the global investment climate. He asked what other participants thought was necessary to maintain investment levels. Two representatives of the City and Metro immediately replied that the most important factor would be a commitment to big new investments in municipal infrastructure.

A questioner raised the issue of market value assessment and said that in theory, that must be the direction that decisions should go. He asked municipal representatives what the alternatives were to using market value assessment as a base for raising new municipal revenues.

This question was not dealt with by the city representatives present. Two Metro representatives said that the Metro compromise on market value assessment had been carefully designed as an interim breathing space on the way to a more solid long-term financing structure. They said that Metro is looking at ways in addition to the property tax of funding new programs. Much will depend on the result of the provincial-municipal disentanglement exercise which may clarify revenue and expenditure responsibilities.

6 Policing Issues In The 1990s

Presentation by Susan Eng, Chair, Police Services Board of Metropolitan Toronto, November 8, 1991.

Richard Gilbert welcomed Susan Eng to the breakfast seminar. He said that she had been born in downtown Toronto and had a law degree from the University of Toronto. After having worked in the provincial Ministry of Treasury and Economics, she had spent 14 years as a tax lawyer. She has also been heavily involved in community activities. In 1989, she was appointed to the Metropolitan Toronto Police Services Board, and became its chair in 1991. Richard Gilbert said that while sitting on the Management Committee of Metro Council he had been enormously impressed by the calibre of the budget submission put forward to the committee this year by Susan Eng on behalf of the Board.

Susan Eng opened her presentation by saying that the last six months had been a period of rapid change in Metropolitan Toronto, especially in terms of policing issues. She said she was very interested in what the Canadian Urban Institute was trying to do to help the metropolitan area adapt effectively to changes in the urban environment. Similarly, she said the police force is trying to respond to rapid changes in the world around it. Because people and organizations are normally resistant to change she said that appropriate responses and adaptations present a formidable challenge.

She said she had been fortunate to have had an informal dialogue soon after she took on her current post with the senior police officers at a senior management course at the University of Toronto. During a fascinating exchange of views, she said she was very pleased to find a real understanding among the senior officers about where the force was and where it had to go.

Susan Eng said that Toronto has been justifiably proud of its reputation as a safe city, even though the image has recently become a little tarnished. In spite of this, statistics show that Toronto is much safer than other large Canadian cities like Montreal, Vancouver, Edmonton or Hamilton. There is still not much random violence, and 80 per cent of murders are committed by acquaintances of the victim. Women in Metro, however, are now beginning to feel unsafe after dark on the streets.

She said that the increase in the number of guns in the Toronto area was the biggest current crime problem and expressed her pleasure that the House of Commons had passed the gun control bill the previous day. As she said, Marc Levine could never have killed 14 female university students with a knife. She said there was no reason for people to carry guns in the city. Banning them would not eliminate crime but it would make crimes tougher to commit.

Eng said that many polls have shown a renaissance of populism that makes it difficult or impossible to impose solutions from above. This phenomenon, coupled with the fact that many people have been left out of the mainstream, which has led to violence on the part of some as a means of giving vent to frustration, poses a new challenge to those in authority. Research and experience have shown that there must be an integrated, systematic approach to the causes of crime. People must be made to feel that they are a part of a new order. This requires a change in approach on the part of the police. But since the police are in the position of protecting the existing order, they cannot be expected to be more progressive than society as a whole.

All of these factors, Eng said, lead to the need for community-based policing. Local police officers must reflect the community and be involved in the growth and dynamics of the neighbourhood. This will require training, getting the police out of cars and personally onto the street, and creating a sense of ownership of the police on the part of the community.

In terms of the management of the police force, the new directions will require a greater sense by police officers that they are a part of the ownership and management of the police force. This must lead to a real sense of participating in the shaping of new directions and not just "malicious obedience".

The public and society, Eng said, have a role to play in dealing with crime in the city. It may be that a policy of full employment is the most effective way of preventing crime. She said the public must be wary of simplistic solutions like tougher judges and more jails. Everyone must be involved in tackling the core reasons for crime and working for the future of their communities.

Eng said that the shifting atmosphere makes for strains in relations between the police and municipal councils. People are pressing municipal councils to authorize more police at the same time as they are pressing for no tax increases and less spending. Crime statistics are leading some municipal politicians to demand simplistic solutions.

She said that the way out of this dilemma is to allocate resources more efficiently. People must expect delays in police responses for less vital calls for service. The budget crunch at Metro in 1991-92 means that the Police Services Board will not get all the money it may have wanted from the municipality. She said that two years ago when there was a $13 million overrun in the police spending, some people used the "politics of fear" in telling Metro Council that if they didn't make up the deficit, criminals would take over. Eng said she would not be part of using such tactics.

She said that the police had to operate on the basis of modern management techniques - setting up goals and objectives, assigning priorities and getting rid of obsolete programs. This will lead to the civilization of some programs so that the police are only used for those activities for which they have a unique training.

Eng said that setting goals and priorities occupied much of the time of the Board. She has received valuable advice from Judge Bick, who had set up the Police Services Board and was its chairman for 20 years. Bick had told her of the difficulties he had in bringing broader objectives to the police force.

Eng described the functions of the Board as policy, management, appeals and discipline relating to charges against the police, and an overall responsibility for community relations. This last function involved having a sense of what the public wants and what governments expect. The effective functioning of the Board requires a cooperative approach to relations between it and the force. She said that some tension is inevitable but it must be creative and dynamic. She said someone has compared the Board's work to that of a tug trying to nudge around a large steamship. She prefers a parallel to a pilot, who knows the direction he wants to go, but who must be prepared to shift direction from time to time to get around obstacles. She closed her presentation by saying that Metro has an opportunity to emulate the best examples of other cities as it works to improve its police services.

Discussion

The first questioner asked if Susan Eng thought that Metro Toronto comprised the appropriate geographic territory for the police force. He speculated that it might be more appropriate to have a broad police force covering the Greater Toronto Area along with more local or community police boards or organizations. In reply, Susan Eng said that she had organized meetings of the police boards in the GTA. These meetings have attempted to identify issues that are common to the broader region such as training needs, cooperation on cross-border cases, employment equity requirements in the GTA and the dynamics of urban growth and its policing implications. She said that these meetings are very useful because there is an urban-rural split in province-wide organizations and with each force having one voice, issues of a particular concern in the GTA do not tend to get priority. She stressed that while these region-wide issues had to be addressed, there was also a need to go down to the neighbourhoods so that police are part of the community. Priorities will be different in different local communities and the relative priorities as among tackling traffic problems, drugs or prostitution will vary. She said the philosophy of a report on policing priorities "Beyond 2000" reflects the joint requirement of a large-scale organization with deployment of resources reflecting local priorities.

A participant agreed strongly that our police forces should avoid the mistakes of other forces, particularly those in the US. She asked whether Eng thought police officers were adequately trained to deal with new and complex issues that they inevitably would have to face. In reply Eng said that there was a heightened need for new training on urban issues and that there were quite different training needs for large urban forces and smaller, more rural forces. She said that current training does not give an officer a sufficient command of the criminal code nor does it provide enough training for firearms proficiency and confidence.

She said that investment in training had to be a high priority for police forces. Many older officers have had little formal training or outside experience and may have a sense they are being left behind on new issues. This insecurity can lead to abrasive and authoritarian behaviour. The shift work nature of policing has often made it difficult for young officers to pursue formal education. She said that it is crucial to avoid an isolation of police officers from broader issues in society. Overcoming this danger requires a combination of more formal education for new officers and increasing in-service training.

The participant went on to comment that she was happy that the GTA boards had been brought together. She wondered if it were possible to bring to these GTA meetings papers on training needs and priorities and statistics containing the views of police officers themselves of what training priorities should be. Susan Eng commented that to some extent police boards exist on the sufferance of the forces. It is difficult for a board to counter the chain of command by reaching out directly to individual officers. She added that with flatter, less hierarchical organizational structures, it will be easier for the views of individual officers to be heard.

A questioner asked Susan Eng for her comments on the pros and cons of whether the appointment of the majority of the membership of police boards should be a prerogative of the province or the municipalities. In response she said that she had never understood completely the rationale behind the province's need to appoint a majority of board members. She thought it was probably because the province, with the constitutional authority for the administration of justice, wanted to ensure a certain uniformity across the province and avoid disparities in policing standards among localities. She reflected that she might not have been appointed to the Metro board by the municipality. She said that in the past appointments had been made without much regard for reflecting the diversity of the community, although this had changed recently without arousing much controversy. Overall, she said there needed to be a balance between municipal and provincial appointments - and maybe that balance should be better.

A participant said he was bothered about the concept of a police officer being expected to be part of the community. He said the public expects the police to respond to emergencies rather than being a proactive element.

Susan Eng said that this is not exactly what she meant by community policing. She said that policing can either have the objective of "catching the bad guys" or preventing crime. She said that in the past, city policing has tended to focus on "catching the bad guys", which responds to a macho image of the police but which may not do much to prevent crime. The preventative role requires much broader training and more problem-solving skills. She used the example of uniforms as an example of her point. The police now get a special allowance for plain-clothes duty. She said it didn't seem right to her that uniforms are bought for the police who then get an allowance for taking them off. She believes that the police should be proud of their uniforms, which should be worn for preventative as well as response functions.

A questioner said he was interested in Eng's responses related to the need for broader training of police officers. He asked her if there was a role for the board in the education of the public on police matters.

Eng replied that there was a vacuum in this area that was somewhat difficult to fill with a part-time board, not all of whom are fully knowledgeable on all aspects of policing. She said the easiest approach for some board members had been to publicly support whatever the police do. She said she believed that there must be knowledgeable public dialogue challenging traditional approaches to policing. She said she thought the board should commission research, stimulate debate at the board level and disseminate the result to the public. She said the board had not previously had a focused sense of public information requirements which had sometimes led to futile exercises with people talking at cross purposes She said she was trying to get a series of briefing papers out to the media on a number of policing issues, in order to stimulate a constructive dialogue.

A questioner asked what Eng thought could be done to cut down on the number of guns. She replied that this required a combination of education, legislation at all levels and enforcement. Changing attitudes through education is vital because some young people carry guns as a badge of courage. Other role models must be presented. Guns cannot be glorified. The thinking must be derided that there is some kind of a right in Canada to own and carry firearms. It must be shown that the mere presence and availability of guns can lead to death and injury by an angry spouse or in the heat of an argument. While there needs to be tough controls on the sale of guns, guns can be stolen or "smuggled in". She said that when Canada had a problem of cigarette smuggling, a system was developed whereby they could be detected in cars by lasers. She said gun manufacturers could be forced to manufacture guns with an alloy that would aid in detection. She said that it should be possible for gun lovers to pursue their recreation in a controlled environment. Municipalities could pass by-laws requiring guns at home to be locked or guns to be stored at rifle ranges. Photo identification could be required for the purchase of ammunition.

A questioner said there was a relationship between urban planning and the preventing of crime. Susan Eng was asked if the Board had a position on land-use issues. She replied that there was no Board position but that it was important in designing urban plans that many agencies, including the police, should be working together. She said there were a number of simple things that could be fed into the urban planning process from a policing perspective relating to design issues like the height of fences or the arrangement of dead end streets. She said that on broader issues there needs to be much more coordination between the police and other community organizations. She used the example of the desirability of a police officer being able to turn over to social agencies youths who have not been charged but who are in trouble. Often the police officer has information that can help in the resolution of domestic problems but neither the time nor the mandate to take necessary further steps. There is an intense desire on the part of the police to serve the public.. There needs to be a much better system for them to coordinate their work with other social agencies.

A questioner asked for examples of cross-GTA cooperation possibilities. She said there was a great potential to use the latest technology to deploy police more effectively to different areas within the GTA where particular needs existed. She said criminals can be profiled on a GTA basis.

A participant asked for examples of potential "civilianization" of police activities. She replied that many of the court security functions do not need to be performed by police officers. Within police organizations, many administrative functions like scheduling can be performed by others. Some of the corporate functions such as planning, computing, accounting or forensic activities can be handled by civilians or by a mix of officers and civilians. There is a waste now in using and training police officers for functions that are not central to their role.

The discussion ended with a participant commenting on the increased involvement of police and the crime issue in the municipal election campaign.

7 Children First: Differences in Direction Between Municipalities and School Boards

Presentation by Fiona Nelson, Trustee, Toronto Board of Education, November 22, 1991.

Richard Gilbert welcomed Fiona Nelson. He said that Ned McKeown, Executive Director of the Metropolitan Toronto Public School Board and a regular attendee at the breakfast seminars, had made the point on numerous occasions that education needs to be a more important element in the planning of the Greater Toronto Area, especially since educational spending takes about half of property tax revenues. The Institute answered this plea by inviting the most experienced school trustee in the Greater Toronto Area, Fiona Nelson, to be a speaker. He said that she has been a school trustee for 15 years, and had just been elected to her seventh term - once again, campaigning without the benefit of election signs. She has been chair of the Toronto Board on four occasions and had led the Board into many creative innovations.

Gilbert said that Fiona Nelson has lived a life of independence and forthrightness in whatever she has done. Her interests are wide and include working on the provincial Round Table on the Environment and Economy, with the Fair Tax Commission and in the world of agriculture.

Fiona Nelson said she wanted to focus her remarks around children as an example of the different directions in which municipalities and school board were heading. Municipalities, she said, are firmly heading towards a disentanglement of responsibilities. School boards on the other hand, are heading for more entanglement.

She said she picked the topic "Children First" because this was the theme of her election campaign. She had chosen it because the public was pressing to talk about taxes first and she was afraid that, as had happened too often in the past, the children would end up last. She said she had produced a series of background papers as her election platform on the theme "Children First". Her theme was that our future depends on treating children as a high priority through an integrated, and not the customary fragmented, public policy approach.

She said the school should be considered as the focal point of the community. An appropriate measure for the size of a community is the local school and its surrounding area. There are, however, different scales for different aspects of educational management: the school, the local board, the regional board and the province.

She said she had recently been one of 800 participants at an important conference on Canada's children in Ottawa which had been ignored by the media. The theme was that for our future economic competitiveness it was only common sense and in our best interest to ensure that our children are well prepared for the future.

She said that the school can be a means of tackling some of our health problems - health costs now represent more than one-third of provincial budgetary expenditures and are essentially out of control. And yet these expenditures have done very little to improve our overall state of health. In Toronto, for example, the number of low birth-weight babies is increasing - an important measure of our state of health and of our economy. Nelson said that this problem can be overcome cheaply. Agnes Higgins of the Montreal Diet Dispensary had demonstrated clearly that by providing daily good nutrition to women pregnant with high risk babies, the babies could quickly be brought up to regular health and strength. This is a public health program with enormous pay-offs. She said that an effective nutrition program is being established in Toronto for $150,000 - less than it costs to treat one baby in an incubator in a hospital. Many children in incubators become public charges for years. She said that her message is the interrelationship of public health and education issues. If we want children to benefit from the school system, they must be healthy. Unfortunately, although we know what needs to be done, we don't do it.

Nelson said that if we looked on schools as centres for our children, we could develop a whole series of health and community services that could be an important part of our society. Through the schools good habits can be taught and prevention can replace cure. She said that a school food program had been launched that week by the Toronto Board of Education in six schools, with two more shortly to be added. The program is based on six criteria:

1) it involves the Board of Health and the Board of Education working together with parents
2) it is a universal, not a charitable program
3) it will be steadily funded
4) it will be "garbageless" and thus an environmental education program
5) it will be culturally appropriate (she said it was already operating in this way in the Board's boarding schools for natural science and music) and
6) it will be community-based. While there are central standards and controls, the programs will be locally-administered and staffed. Each school community will develop its own program with its own characteristics, the main proviso being that it must contain a nutrition and health component in its curriculum.

Nelson said that it was clear from the work of the Premier's Council on Health that health and education programs should be integrated at the community level. She said she had been the representative of the Toronto Board of Education on the Toronto Board of Health and had helped to develop this program. She said she believed that these Toronto models could serve as effective pilots for other parts of the province.

This local model of collaboration could also serve as a model of "disentanglement" or "entanglement" within the province. She urged the Ministries of Education, Health, Culture and Communications, Tourism and Recreation and Community and Social Services to get their act together to see how their programs and those of the municipalities could be implemented through the school system.

The result should be a seamless day for children through daycare, nutrition, educational and recreational programs in the schools, all arranged through a committed community group.

Nelson said that for this approach to be realized, a host of conflicting programs, legislation and regulation needed to be modified or eliminated. Tough Ministry of Environment standards, for example, requiring large acreage in rural areas for new schools should be eliminated and composting toilets should become the norm. Environmentally "smart" projects and solutions could be exported to the third world. We could move to a more competitive global position if we thought of our local problems in global terms. By developing new creative solutions to the needs of children in local areas, we can become a model for the world. In concluding, Nelson said that we must urge school boards to turn local schools into real community centres.

Discussion

The first questioner noted that Fiona Nelson had sketched a vision of local schools providing services within a framework of regional standards and management. He asked if there was really a need for local school boards. In reply Nelson said nothing we have created should be set in cement. She said that if there were appropriate provincial or regional standards, it should be up to the local community to decide on local organization and programs. Province-wide uniformity stifles dynamism. Local initiative is more practical, democratic and creative.

Another participant said if the schools became a resource for the entire community, perhaps school boards should be abolished. The critics of the current municipal system say that local initiative is often stifled because of the multitude of special purpose bodies (like boards of education) and conditional grants that hamstring overall local decision-making and priority setting.

In reply Fiona Nelson said she was not hung up about structure. Different structural solutions might be appropriate in different areas of the province. Teachers are not needed to run an overall system. In some rural areas a "countryside commission" involving the Ministry of Agriculture and Food and dedicated, among other things, to preserving good agricultural land, might be an appropriate body to coordinate the community activities of the schools. Elsewhere, it might be the municipality or a school board. The important thing is that the objective of using the school as a community focus is met. It should be up to local groups to make organizational decisions. In the end, it will come down to people's theological views of human nature. If you believe people are inherently bad, you belong to the jail guard school of thought. If you think they are capable of change for the better, you are part of the John Howard school.

A representative of a school board commented that in view of the current fiscal situation, perhaps it would be more appropriate to abolish municipalities than school boards. He went on to say that some of the proposals might be too expensive for school boards to take on and would probably require further equalization from richer to poorer regions of the province. Nelson replied that in the overall sense, money can be saved, especially in the health field, by prevention through the school rather than through expensive cure. Proposals would involve money from ministries other than Education. Expensive turf wars must be avoided at all costs. Real successes will require courage to surmount traditional bureaucratic or regulatory barriers. Lessons can be learned from mistakes in the first pilot programs.

A participant said that while locally-based programs can often save money in the long run, they can cost more in the short run. There is a danger at this time of budgetary restraint by the federal and provincial governments, that funds for pilot projects will be cut off before appropriate longer-term results can be assessed. How can we get over the hump?

Nelson said that political and moral courage will be needed to support communities through local experiments. She said that more accessible local programs should provide indicators of overall need. She said that just like household planning, long-term planning is needed for our economic future. She said that when she was on the Premier's Technology Council there was a concern on the part of businessmen about programs with only long-term payoffs. Nevertheless most were convinced that if we want self-sufficiency in skills we must plan now. Cutting health care costs requires the introduction now of low technology, low cost, effective ways of doing things. In this respect, she said the passage of the bill recognizing midwifery that week was a very constructive step. When she taught nutrition at George Brown College, she had always been amazed how many students had never heard of cheaper ways of making soup than buying it in cans. She said there are many good, low tech, cheap ways of eating. Similarly there are many ways through creative intensification of producing simple, affordable and good housing.

A questioner asked how the complexity and duplication of school boards could be reduced. Nelson said she thought the financing of separate schools to grade thirteen had been a tremendous mistake and had not resulted in a jot of increase in the overall quality of education. The increasing separation of school jurisdictions had caused many problems. She said the three pillars in the development of a child had always been church, school and home. In many instances, church and home have not been able to do the job. If schools are to do more for the child, they should be doing it together. She said our constitutional distinctions have helped lawyers, but not children. If we really put our children first, we might design both our constitutions and our cities differently.

A questioner said she was concerned about child abuse and asked for improved ways of dealing with its causes other than through structural change. In reply, Fiona Nelson said that we must ensure that our communities are made up of real neighbourhoods with sidewalks and plenty of capacity to walk to all of the important community facilities.

When we separate people, we create problems. She said that her ward is full of little villages with old ladies on porches keeping an eye on things. A sense of community is destroyed in areas characterized by 80 foot lots with no sidewalks. Anonymity leads to violence that can be gotten away with. Dependence on cars and malls can lead to serious problems.

A participant asked for her comments on taxes and income inequities. He said that a growing imbalance of incomes was creating societal problems. Vulnerable people in Louisiana voted for the simple but extreme solutions of David Duke. He suggested that in a time of fiscal restraint it was essential to get all sectors in society behind a community approach to solving problems. If the private sector is on side, innovative approaches may become practical. Overall restraint will be needed to get some of Fiona Nelson's proposals higher up the agenda.

Fiona Nelson said that both leadership and restraint will be required. During World War II many people did many things against their own immediate interests in support of a common cause. She said there has been a "cocooning" in parts of North American society where people have withdrawn into their own family fortresses. Communities must be more accessible to all. We could, she said, for example, bring hard pressed farmers into a school food program geared to greater agricultural self-sufficiency.

A participant suggested that the Toronto Board of Education might show leadership by taking a freeze or cut in salaries in order to divert money into worthwhile programs. Fiona Nelson replied that it would be reasonable to ask everyone in the public service to accept a three-year salary freeze to balance off the job security public servants have. She said she was very concerned about the destruction of our manufacturing sector and its partial replacement by poor jobs in the service sector. The necessary shifting of resources to future-oriented sectors and programs could be aided by some groups like school trustees taking symbolic cuts.

A questioner said that neighbourhoods are different for different people. She said she wanted to be closer to her children and that this meant that her neighbourhood school might be the closest one to her office rather than her home. Nelson agreed saying that there could be "communities of interest" that were not just geographic. Workplace day care was often very useful. As long as we are addicted to cars, people will live far from their jobs. Environmentally the ideal would be for people and their jobs to be closer together. She said that this was another example of why master plans were suspect and localized solutions necessary.

A participant said he was surprised that Nelson, an NDP'er, should be talking about neo-conservative measures like cutting back salaries when there were good cost-cutting possibilities in community preventative programs. He said that battles with the unions should be avoided. Nelson replied that unions should be brought on side in the interest of common goals - an effort that will require honesty and leadership.

Another participant commented that this would be difficult if there were a perception that corporations were not pulling their weight when it came to paying taxes. Nelson said that at the Fair Tax Commission there were groups looking at wealth taxes and a minimum corporate tax. She said that income differences in Canada are widening and that there is a popular image that some people are getting away with many of the benefits of society without a sufficient contribution. We should be making extreme wealth socially unacceptable. Most people, she said, have a reservoir of good faith and a commitment to national ends. Society should be mobilized.

A participant asked the speaker if she thought the schools could be made centres for environmental issues. Nelson replied that children can be ambassadors for good environmental practices. They can show their parents how to create less garbage. Schools can become models for good environmental practice, through such programs as "the garbageless lunch". Peer group pressure at school can be very useful.

A questioner asked for Nelson's views on how to achieve the necessary coordination with other agencies to implement her proposed school-based programs. She replied that this was a tough job because of the many fences between programs, especially at the provincial level. She said that locally there is a Board of Education representative on the Board of Health. There is an education representative on Toronto's health and physical fitness committee. There are negotiations with the Ministry of Health for joint funding of school health programs. Schools should be able to deal with local communities, the federal government and everything in between.

A questioner asked Nelson for her views on the most desirable ways of paying for public services - through property taxes or income taxes, for example. She replied that the Fair Tax Commission is trying to tackle this issue. The downloading of financial responsibilities had created inequities. People are ready to pay more for some programs when they think the payment system is fair. There is no ready answer as to who should pay: just because something is delivered locally, it doesn't need to be paid for locally.

8 Why Hasn't the Greater Toronto Area Vision Happened Already?

A Presentation by Jane Pepino, QC, Partner, Aird and Berlis, December 6, 1991.

Jane Pepino was introduced by Alan Broadbent, President of Maytree Foundation Capital Corporation and Vice-Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Canadian Urban Institute. He said that a combination of the speaker, Jane Pepino, and the important topic "Why Hasn't the Greater Toronto Area Vision Already Happened?" had produced the largest turnout yet for one of the Institute's breakfast seminars. He said that Jane Pepino, a partner of the law firm Aird & Berlis, was probably the leading planning and development lawyer in the Greater Toronto Area. She has had a dynamic career, both as a lawyer and an activist in many areas of public policy. Among her accomplishments have been membership on the Ontario Human Rights Commission, on the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, and as the first female member and then vice-chair of the Metropolitan Toronto Police Commission. She has also chaired a number of special inquiries on such topics as half-way houses, the participation of women in politics and public violence against women and children.

Jane Pepino made the following presentation:

"My thanks to the Canadian Urban Institute on their invitation to speak at this series of breakfast seminars. I became aware of and involved in the work of the Canadian Urban Institute at the beginning of this year when a group of officials - bureaucrats, not elected - from the City of Moscow were sent to the Institute to be "students" of the Institute for a week, in an attempt to expose and train them in what was necessary to set up a planning structure, a decision-making structure and a fiscal management structure, for the new, democratic Moscow. I had a truly enlightening opportunity to spend some time not only lecturing to them, but also socially, and I was particularly struck by the dichotomy they presented, both collectively, as "the officials", and individually, simply as people. On the one hand, they were like sponges, soaking up new data; like children, open to new ideas; - like true leaders, willing to discuss and consider wild ideas and bold initiatives. On the other hand, they had unclear and seemingly shifting mandates and they were well aware that they operated in an extremely volatile political environment: as a result they were as hidebound, and unwilling to rock the boat or offend another jurisdiction as any apparatchik is reputed to be. In short - they reminded me of the Office for the Greater Toronto Area.

Now - I hasten to add that when Don Stevenson suggested to me that I speak to you about why I think the GTA "Vision" has not materialized, he said nothing about the Muscovites - the parallel is entirely mine.

When addressing the issue of the GTA Vision, let me start with some seemingly ancient history, because it sets the stage for later events. It also highlights what I believe to be a fundamental precept which is often overlooked - planning, that is, the setting out of plans, guidelines, rules or goals for a particular geographic area, is inextricably linked with the decision-making structure leading to first the creation of those plans, guidelines, rules or goals, and, secondly to their implementation. In short, the medium becomes the message - the means create the end.

And so, the history. In 1944, the Provincial Government established a Department of Planning and Development, with a broad mandate to plan the economic and physical development of the province. But with the end of the war, there suddenly came more immediate problems - the immense pressure for fast, and vast growth - the Veterans' Affairs housing for example. Therefore, to regulate this, the first comprehensive Planning Act was passed in 1946. It was administered by the Provincial Department of Planning and Development, because they were to have created a provincial plan which they could have then implemented. This plan never happened, and the department was shut down in 1960.

In the meantime, however, and in the absence of the promised Provincial Plan, Toronto and environs were in trouble. Thirteen police forces; thirteen fire departments; chaotic, inefficient and uncoordinated sewer, water and storm water systems, and limited financial ability on the part of local municipalities to maintain or expand them.

And so Metropolitan Toronto was created in 1953 and still later, the thirteen local municipalities became six. Having thereby created a more sensible decision-making and delivery system, the Province again began toiling to produce broad planning strategies. But those didn't really surface until the Toronto-Centred Region plan of 1970 - what was to, among other things, provide a framework for local planning. Some other initiatives undertaken at about this time, were to put in place the decision-making structures necessary to implement the planning framework, and included the creation of additional Regional Governments, and the legislation creating the Niagara Escarpment Plan - and Commission - and the Parkway Belt.

But - that basically ended the "Design for Development" initiatives, and we then launched into an approximately 9 year period of review which, after mighty labouring, produced the 1983 Planning Act - a mouse, after the gestation period of an elephant. In fairness, one notable change (in addition to the renumbering of the sections) was the provision for promulgation of provincial "policy statements", to which all lower tier municipal plans would then have to conform, and for the declaration by the Minister of a "provincial interest" in a matter before the OMB, effectively lifting the final decision out of the jurisdiction of the Board to the Cabinet.

However, having thus equipped itself with the jurisdiction to "take charge" of certain aspects of planning, the Province has adopted only three policy statements - on flood plains, aggregate extraction and housing, - it has drafted nothing on a particular geographic area such as the Greater Toronto Area or on a theme of systems, such as sewage lines, transit growth or the like. Obviously, one reason for the failure to use these provisions of the Planning Act was that no plan had been developed.

In the meantime, however, by 1987-88, it became clear to any observer that the original Provincial goal of 1944, 1953, 1970 and 1983 - of coordinating services in Ontario's, and arguably - Canada's, most important urban centre, had become lost in urban sprawl, buried in garbage, mired up to its neck in sewage and storm water, stuck in traffic and left waiting at the bus stop. It was also obvious as, I submit, it had been in 1944, 1953, 1970 and 1983, that the solutions had to involve more than one level of government, and more than one jurisdiction. Ad hoc solutions between various levels of government already existed - for example, Metro's garbage was going to the Region of York, but the Town of Vaughan was also obviously directly involved - they were getting some of their water from Metro, and were looking to Metro pipes to handle sewage the Region could no longer provide capacity for. Moreover, the timing seemed right because the affected Regional municipalities were dealing with their own Official Plans: Peel and York were still struggling to produce a first O.P. and Halton, Durham and Metro were all approaching reviews of theirs. Finally, the populace was getting "green" and matters of environmental protection were rapidly moving on to the public agenda. As usual, David Crombie summed the situation up pithily - and poetically - in his Royal Commission report "Watershed". He wrote:

> Rivers, creeks and the lake are polluted and unfit for swimming, and cannot be used for drinking water unless they are treated. Persistent organic chemicals and heavy metals are found in the air, water, wildlife, and soils of the region. The pressures of development continue to pose a threat to wildlife habitat and species diversity.
>
> Landfills are nearing capacity and more sewage and storm water run-off are generated than can be treated effectively. Transportation networks are at, or above, capacity. Prime agricultural land and green space are being lost to apparently relentless urbanization, and the Oak Ridges Moraine, a precious resource for ground water, wildlife, and open space, is threatened.
>
> At the same time, the region must cope with strong development pressures that will likely increase in the coming decades. Projections are that the population of the Greater Toronto Area will grow from 3.73 million people in 1986 to 6.02 million in 2021. In 1986, about 25 per cent of the area - 1,524 square kilometers (376,400 acres) was urbanized. If development patterns continue in the current form, expected population growth, would urbanize an additional 900 square kilometers (223,300 acres) of land by 2021.

So what did the Provincial Government of the day do to face this challenge? - it set up the GTCC - the Greater Toronto Coordinating Committee, as an administrative group bringing together officials of the five Regions and 30 local municipalities. At the same time, a committee of the Ontario Government ministries implementing programs having a direct impact on the area was set up. Anyone want to guess how many that involved? - Eleven - There is a school of thought that the Province took the stake it did in the Skydome simply to ensure it had a big enough venue for the meetings of these two groups.

Then, in 1988, to quote the brochure "to emphasize the leadership and team building role of the OGTA both inside and beyond the Provincial Government, a Deputy Minister was appointed for the OGTA" and the reporting responsibility was established to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The deputy minister, Gardner Church, is here today. More recently, the Provincial government changed the reporting of the OGTA to a new specific Minister for the GTA.

So what is it that the OGTA is to do? Produce a vision report? - in effect - be the body that actually produces a plan? No - I quote the mandate, again from the brochure:

1) It keeps open the channels of communication among all governments and boards in the Greater Toronto Area. Moreover, it keeps all of the levels of government in touch with each other - including the many Ontario Government ministries that implement programs with direct impact on the area.

2) It brings together all of the governments, boards and ministries to deal with immediate problems that are facing municipalities across the Greater Toronto Area - problems that threaten the quality of life of the people who live here; problems which no one government, board or ministry can solve by itself.

3) It helps all governments to exchange ideas and develop a consensus on what the Greater Toronto Area should look like 20 years from now - the kind of urban environment the people will want to enjoy; and the population patterns, services and amenities that are necessary to make it a reality. In none of these areas does the OGTA make the decisions; in all of them it brings together the people and governments who do make the decisions, and ensures that all of them are working in concert. Basically, the OGTA makes sure that nothing falls between the cracks.

It is important to note - it was <u>not</u> the OGTA which commissioned the "Visions" studies, but rather the Greater Toronto Coordinating Committee - the group of representatives of the five Regions and many of the thirty local municipalities.

So let us for a moment consider the "Visions" document. In fact, if "Visions" is intended to mean a document of foresight, one which anticipates and makes provision for future events, we don't have any such document.

What we do have is a document commissioned by the GTCC, entitled the Urban Structures Concepts Study and released in June, 1990. The Minister of the day said the study was to "stimulate public discussion and consultation so that a consensus may emerge about how to manage future growth". It simply reviewed three possible concepts, and although it didn't firmly come down in favour of a single concept, I would bet my first born that "nodal" will be chosen.

Next item of note - the Region of York and the OGTA were roundly criticized for lack of action on any planning direction in an OMB decision released in May.

Exactly one year after the release of the "Concepts" study, the new Minister released, in June 1991, a report "Growing Together" which summarized the consultation process on the Urban Structures Concepts Study. Four years after the establishment of a process to deal with problems of mythic properties, the report speaks of an "emerging consensus". Sometimes this consensus is on the nature of the problem, sometimes on the broad outline (note "broad outline") of the desired solutions. It concludes "the issues raised require further study, debate and discussion to clarify the points of consensus(!!!!) and to determine the specific course of action to be taken." One particularly noteworthy comment - "in light of past efforts to coordinate planning in the GTA, respondents urged the establishment of a more effective process for planning, implementation and funding."

Unless I am mistaken, this is a statement that the respondents - the governments both regional and local, want changes in the process of planning, as well as the plan itself. That is, they are prepared to see changes in the decision-making structure.

I saw in this statement the glimmer of some hope, because it is clear that, without changes, we will continue to plan the way we did in 1946: planning **and** decision-making remain local in jurisdiction, parochial, ad hoc, reactive and regulatory in application.

And so - we have to see who could do the job. It is clear that the OGTA, at least at its inception, was not intended to fill that role. Again, to quote the information brochure's answer to the rhetorical question: "Is the OGTA becoming, in effect, another level of government":

> "No, and it cannot under the way it was set up. It has no independent mandate in legislation. Officials of the OGTA, the Greater Toronto Coordinating Committee, and all officials who meet and work with them are all responsible to elected representatives of the different governments.
>
> The OGTA's job is to spot issues, trends and problems, and report on them to governments and ministries. It brings together appropriate people to recommend actions on the issues and to resolve problems and deficiencies in programs and services. **However, it is up to the various governments to decide whether to pursue it, and how.**

> The OGTA will bring governments together to examine the kind of area Greater Toronto should be in 20 years, but elected municipal and provincial representatives must make the decisions that will shape vision, and turn it "into reality"."

That was 1988.

The June, 1991 document notes:

> "The Royal Commission, the Greenlands study, and most Regions and municipalities have called on the Province to take a strong leadership role in defining the framework for planning in the GTA, and in coordinating implementation. But regional and area municipalities do not want the Province to impose plans. This did not work in the 1970s and would be even less acceptable now."

Which leads me to the question - if the Province will only adopt that which is agreed to by the local municipalities, what happens if they won't agree? For example, the report notes that "support for a concentrated nodal form of development is not universal, and questions have been raised about the feasibility of intensification". Somehow, I can't see the politicians elected by the inhabitants of traditional suburban 50 foot lots leaping upon the suggestion of, say 15 units per gross acre, which averages double those densities on a net basis, and produces less than 20% "low density". Recognizing that any new growth will mainly take place in "new" areas (the existing regional development generally being less than 20 years old, and therefore not "ripe for development"), leads to the recognition that the new areas are "beyond" existing areas. The traffic to service new areas, therefore, gets dragged past through existing areas. Moreover, MTO studies have shown that existing road capacity won't handle any of the three concepts - this means new roads, new transit, or both - and who pays? Simple realities such as this have fueled a resistance on the part of some municipalities to buy into the "emerging consensus". Just one month ago, the Minister of Municipal Affairs was told that "Members of (a certain) Regional Council are frustrated by the difficulty in reaching consensus with the Province regarding future land uses in the Region", and "there is considerable tension between the desire of local municipalities to control their own destiny and the recognition of the roles of the Region and the Province".

There are hundreds of issues that will come up such as garbage that will strengthen the opposition of some municipalities to the provincial vision. We are therefore certain to be left with some municipalities which will oppose any consensus. Simply put, I believe the reason the vision has not materialized is that, although admittedly, the issues are difficult, expensive and complex, there is simply insufficient political will to deal with them: there is no political will at the local and Regional levels to allow the "vision" to happen, and no political will at the Provincial level to **make** it happen, if it is at all unpopular. If consensus **can** be reached, it will either take too long (last year was too late) or will be so broad, so vague, so "guidelines" and "Strategic Planning" as to be unusable.

We are living with the results of governmental pussyfooting, of jurisdictional "after you, Alphonse". We need clarity, within a legislative framework that sets standards and allows appeals; we need cooperation, certainly, but not cooping - no one group or jurisdiction's refusal or inability to act can be permitted to delay or deflect goals agreed to. What the Royal Commission called "broad integrated Regional thinking" to "cut across both traditional boundaries and established jurisdictions" can't, by definition, come from existing local and Regional government. They aren't high enough up the ladder to have an overview. It **must** be the Province. Certainly, Crombie, Kanter and the local and regional governments have said so.

The only shred of evidence I have seen in the public documents that this realization is dawning is one tiny sentence buried in the June 1991 report which speaks of the requirement for a "new coordinating body (definitely **not** a new level of government) but **with specific authority and accountability**". What authority: legislative? - if not, what? - accountability? - to whom? - if not the electorate, the Ministry? - but it proceeds on consensus, not concept. The OGTA is a mediator.

I find this single sentence both internally contradictory and maddeningly vague. It represents a lack of clarity, and a lack of political will on the part of provincial politicians to not only consult and plan, but also to decide, and to act. If there is going to be a coordinating body set it up - say to whom it would be accountable. The Committees, the mediators, the planners, the deputy minister have done their part - the failure of political leadership has, in my judgment, resulted in a GTA which at present is entirely bereft of a vision - instead, the nightmare continues.

My thanks for your attention."

Discussion

The first questioner asked the speaker for her opinion on the roles of regional government. If they were not set up to develop and implement regional visions, should their roles not be reevaluated? Jane Pepino agreed that the roles of regional government should be reevaluated because they had been acting too much like local municipalities. Regional councillors have generally been elected on "back-porch" issues, so their contributions on councils have generally been parochial. The other problem is that most of the truly regional issues go beyond the frontiers of the existing regional governments. She said that if she were a benevolent dictator she would blend the current local and regional governments into a single layer, and then create a supra-regional government. Because this would involve dismantling some of what we have now, it would be politically difficult.

Another participant said he was discouraged, precisely because Jane Pepino was discouraged, about the likelihood of the necessary political will emerging at the provincial level.

He said it will take a greater degree of cabinet solidarity than is now evident and a greater degree of broad vision on the part of regional governments. He said some of the regions, citing Metro Toronto as an example, are building into their official plans a vision for the GTA. He asked the speaker for her views as to how heads can be knocked together in support of an agreed approach to the future.

In reply, Jane Pepino said that strong pressure must be brought to bear on the province to acknowledge publicly that the current state of affairs in the GTA is bad and that sharp and dramatic measures are needed - the planning equivalent of a War Measures Act. She said that it is ridiculous that it now takes 3 1/2 years on average for a new development to get through the planning process when there is only a 1 1/2 year supply of serviced land available. She said it was ironic that the development industry was now putting its faith in the Sewell Commission for a solution.

A participant commented on the reasons for the failure of the Toronto-Centred Region Plan to be implemented. In addition to a lack of political will, it also was related, he said, to the market system in land and the incentive for municipalities to approve development in order to gain assessment. He asked the speaker if she thought the Niagara Escarpment Act could be considered as a model for a "war measures" approach to implementation of the GTA vision.

Jane Pepino said she did not think the Niagara Escarpment plan had been implemented all that autocratically, nor was it being implemented as completely as it should be. She said that what was needed was the political will of King Township, which has a plan and sticks to it in spite of pressures for further development. She said there was a great need for symbols to show that things are going to happen and that visions will be implemented. There is also a need to get political discussions focused on substance and away from process.

A participant said that there was not just a problem of political will because politicians respond to what is put before them by their senior bureaucrats. He said there used to be strong leadership from deputy ministers and other senior officials. More recently, there has been a revolving door of senior people who have been more committed to their careers than to the substance and professionalism of their subject areas. Jane Pepino replied that she had concentrated on the need for political will because she was convinced that the bureaucrats will line up behind a policy thrust backed by political commitment.

Another participant said that the speaker had ignored a fundamental reality - that there are one million people in the GTA who do not believe in a compact vision. The council of Vaughan has to represent an electorate that believes it can and should be able to drive to meaningful employment in 15 minutes. Jane Pepino said that a public education role was important. Gradually the people living in the Niagara Escarpment region are coming to realize the need for saving an important natural feature of the province.

A member of the audience suggested that the speaker should have used "public education" in a different way. School boards and schools must be brought into the intensification debate. He said this was difficult when the province was creating regulations requiring large and unnecessary acreage for new schools. Jane Pepino acknowledged that she did not know how best to involve the educational system in the GTA debate.

A participant said that a consensus among municipalities on a vision was not important. What was of real importance was a provincial decision on a framework within which its own infrastructure spending could be planned. He suggested that the protection of agricultural land around the urbanized areas was a totally unrealistic objective in light of market realities. The province, he said, must get its own act together. If it believes in a dynamic Greater Toronto Area, money cannot be continually siphoned off to other areas of the province (or by the federal government to other parts of Canada). Without the necessary financial support for infrastructure, the Metro Toronto area will not be able to address its own problems. He said that formal land-use plans were not as important as decision-making structures.

A participant expressed confusion about how the province could deal with the challenges of the GTA when it had no money to spend on infrastructure and when, for example, it hopes to stop development on the Oak Ridges moraine. She wondered where the 50,000 new people coming annually to the GTA will live and how they will get there. In response Pepino said that it was not yet time to line up at the US. Consulate for green cards even though more companies may still move south. She said that when we run out of serviced lots, we will probably ease up on standards for new housing.

A participant noted that Canada has used different processes than in the United States to try to reach consensus. In the US. women tried unsuccessfully to get three-quarters of the states to pass an equal rights amendment. In Canada public pressure campaigns were more successful on the constitutional front. He said that a "plan B" was needed for the GTA if there were no consensus among the municipalities. A consensus of opinion leaders would still be essential - previous attempts to implement "visions" had failed in the absence of consensus. He said something other than a "war measures act" approach was needed. Perhaps the leading decision markers should be locked up for a weekend and forced to hammer out an agreement.

Jane Pepino commented that the fight to strengthen sexual equality rights in the constitution had begun by women agreeing over a weekend to commit themselves to this objective. It then took three years to achieve results. She agreed there must be a "plan B" for the GTA and that perhaps a "war measures act" approach was overstating it. It would be too late to wait for the Sewell Commission which does not report until 1993.

She agreed that an approach would be to lock the major stakeholders in a room for two weeks - but she had little confidence (in view of the Meech Lake experience) that this would be seen as an acceptable solution. She said she did not think the Minister for the GTA (Ruth Grier) had been as active for the GTA cause as she had been as a municipal politician. Pepino said she does not sense any overall determination in the provincial cabinet to press ahead to implement the GTA vision.

The participant said that when the decision-makers came out of the locked room they needed to have a sense of support from the public. This had been tried with some success in Oregon. Pepino said there never has been total consensus in Ontario except over the lowest common denominator.

On the constitution there has at least been a recognition that unanimity is not the answer and that amendments should normally require only two-thirds of the governments. She said that an attempt to get even tiny rezoning application through the Township of King will show anyone how a committed government can make a vision happen...and there has been no disaster just because proposals have been turned down. Pepino added that she, a conservative, has been driven to rather intemperate remarks because she is convinced there must be government action on a GTA vision.

A participant suggested that solutions will only come about when economic actors see that planning visions make economic sense. He suggested that the major economic actors must be brought together with the planners and government decision makers. Pepino said she agreed that environmental and economic analysis must be brought together. She said she hoped that the recession will help prepare a recognition that building more super highways is not the solution. Good economic analysis should be provided to municipalities, who are gun-shy about more tax increases, to show the real cost of further urban sprawl.

Another member of the audience said that it should be made clear that consensus does not mean unanimity. Everyone should be given a kick at the can, decisions should be taken and then all parties should be brought together to implement the decisions. Pepino agreed this would be ideal but the problem with the definition is that it requires people who don't agree with a decision to cooperate in its implementation. O[illegible]nents of a decision cannot be allowed to sabotage its implementation.

9 List of Participants *

John Adams
Councillor
City of Toronto

Jane Allen
President
Jane D. Allen Inc. Consultants

Fareed Amin
Executive Assistant
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

John Amodeo
Coordinator
Intergovernmental Relations Branch
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

Caryl Arundel
Director of Policy
Community Services Department
Metropolitan Toronto

Julien Arsenault
Government of Quebec
Representative in Ontario

Maureen Atkinson
President
Urban Marketing Collaborative Inc.

Nancy Autton
CAO Department
Metropolitan Toronto

Jean Barrett
Property Manager
Wittington Properties Ltd.

Alan S. Blott
Lilly, Blott Lawyers

Lisa Blumer
Policy Advisor
Ministry of Housing

Anne Borooah
Ministry of Housing

Ila Bossons
Metro Councillor

Hilda Briks
CAO Department
Metropolitan Toronto

Alan Broadbent
Board Member
Canadian Urban Institute

Ian Bromley
Senior Development Officer
Economic Development Division
Metro Toronto

Lauren Bronson
Walker Wright Young

Michael Brown
CAO Department
Metropolitan Toronto

Joyce Bryant
Chief Executive Officer
North York Public Libraries

Bill Brydon
Policy Advisor to the Minister
Responsible for the Greater Toronto Area

*These are people who attended one or more of the autumn seminars

Judy Buckley
Bell Canada

Susan Chapman
Team Secretary, Buildings Department
City of Toronto

Janice Charland
Urban and Regional Research

Bob Christie
Manager, Education and Urban Affairs
Metropolitan Toronto Board of Trade

Angela Christopolous
CIBC

Colin Chung
Strategic Planner
Region of Peel

Gardner Church
Deputy Minister
Office of the Greater Toronto Area

Tracey Corbett
Metro Planning Department

Al Cormier
Executive Director
Ontario Urban Transit Association

Dan Cowin
Senior Planner
CAO Department
Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto

David Darnell
Plan Examiner, Building Department
City of Toronto

Sylvia Davis
Office of the Greater Toronto Area

Ben Di Raimo
Ministry of Industry, Trade and Technology

Walter Elliott
Department of Works and Environment
City of Scarborough

Don Evans
CAO
Region of Durham

Jeff Evenson
Executive Assistant
Mayor Eggleton's Office

Patricia Falck
Research Associate
Urban Marketing Collaborative Inc.

Lionel Feldman
L.D.F. Consulting

Brian Fenoulhet
Policy Analyst
Policy Planning Secretariat
Ministry of Government Services

Luigi Ferrara
Russocki & Zawadzki

Bill Fleming
Secretary Manager, Real Estate Planning
Bell Canada

John E. Fleming
C.A.O.
Regional Municipality of Halton

Marion E. Fraser
Ontario Hydro

Kevin Garland
Vice-President, Development
CIBC Development Corp.

Michael Garrett
Region of Peel

Hilary Geller
Senior Consultant
S.A. Murray Consulting

Ted Goddard
Vice-President
Proctor & Redfern

Colin Goodfellow
Office of the Minister of Municipal Affairs

G. E. Goodman
Executive Director, Planning & Development
City of Burlington

Aldo Grasselli
Lilly, Bott
Barristers & Solicitors

Ruth Greey
Senior Program Supervisor
Ontario Hydro

Peter Head
C.A.O. Department
Metro Toronto

David Hipgrave
Director of Corporate Planning
Metro Toronto

David Hobbs
Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs

Robert A. Howald
Senior Vice-President, Development
Economic Development Corp.
City of Toronto

Karen Hughes
Assistant Policy Implementation Planner
Ministry of Housing

David Hutcheon
Executive Assistant to Mayor Sinclair
City of Etobicoke

Angela Iozzo
Councillor Gilbert's Office

Neal Irwin
Managing Partner
IBI Group

R. Scott James
Managing Director
Toronto Historical Board

Diana Jardine
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

Barbara Johnston
Office of the Greater Toronto Area

Chris Jones
Community Relations Supervisor
Ontario Hydro

Paul Jones
Manager, Central Regional Office
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

Wendy Joyce
Executive Coordinator, Environmental Policy
Cabinet Office, Government of Ontario

Firoz Kara
Corporate Planning Division
CAO Department
Metro Toronto

Ronald M. Kanter
Lawyer, Wooley, Dale and Dingwall

Steven Keen
Head, Transportation Policy and Planning
UMA Engineering

Fareed Khan
Government Relations Coordinator
Toronto Real Estate Board

Margaret Kipp
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

Ilona Lattner
Councillor Gilbert's Office

Stephen Le Drew
Cassels, Brock & Blackwell

Howard A. Lee
Asset Manager
Paramet Real Estate Services Ltd.

Linda Leighton
Manager, Provincial-Municipal Relations Unit
Ministry of Community and Social Services

Alexander Leman
Leman Group Inc.

Prof. Jim Lemon
Dept. of Geography
University of Toronto

Allan Leibel
Senior Partner
Goodman & Goodman

John Livey
Planning Department
Metro Toronto

Barry Lyon
Barry Lyon Consultants Ltd.

Douglas MacCallum
Ministry of Energy

Sine MacKinnon
Special Assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs

John MacMillan
OGTA

J. G. MacRae
Bell Canada

Malcolm Martini
Acres International

Suzanne Hamilton
Ministry of Community and Social Services

Helen Mason
Peel Board of Education

John Mason
Building Manager
Peel Regional Police

Russell Mathew
Senior Consultant
Hemson Consulting Ltd.

Dan McAlister
Bregman & Hamann

Eleanor McArteer
Development Coordinator
Department of Public Works and the Environment
City of Toronto

Robert McBride
President
B-A Consulting Group Ltd.

Patricia McCarney
Board Member
Canadian Urban Institute

Lorne McCool
Planning Commissioner,
Town of Markham

Sue McDonald
Ministry of Housing

John McGrath
CBC News

Edward McKeown
Director and Secretary Treasurer
Metropolitan Toronto School Board

John MacMillan
Office of the Greater Toronto Area

Gord McRae
Staff Engineer, Real Estate
Bell Canada

Ruth Melady
Central Regional Office
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

John Mende
Coordinator of Development and
Transportation
Department of Public Works and the
Environment
City of Toronto

Keith Menezes
Office of the Greater Toronto Area

Dr. Mofeed Michael
Chief Administrative Officer
Region of Durham

Laurie Monsebraaten
Editorial Writer, Municipal Affairs
Toronto Star

Pauline Morris
Director, Provincial Planning Branch
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

Elizabeth Mueller
Town of Whitby

Paul Mullin
Region of Peel

Natalie Myhal
City of Toronto

Mark Nakamura, Director
Multicultural and Race Relations
Metropolitan Toronto

David Nakelski
Lilly, Blott

Peter Neilsen
S.A. Murray Consulting

Jeffery Olin
Vice President, Development
The Parking Authority of Toronto

Carol Palango
Region of Peel
Executive Assistant to Chairman

Brian Parker
Fasken, Campbell & Godfrey

John Paton
Legal Department
City of Toronto

Chuck Pautler
Office of the Greater Toronto Area

David Pell
Director, Development Initiatives
Community Business Centre

Jane Pepino
Aird & Berlis

David Pell
Director, Development Initiatives
Community Business Centre

Len Pitura
Deputy Minister
Ontario Water Services Secretariat
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

Sylvia Pivko
Metropolitan Toronto Separate School Board

Christine Primeau
Office of the Greater Toronto Area

Kathy Redfearn
York University Student

Heather Reynolds-Pew
Office of the Greater Toronto Area

Brian Riddell
Assistant Deputy Minister
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

Jan Rush
Assistant Deputy Minister
Office of the Greater Toronto Area

George Rust D'Eye
Weir & Foulds

Evelyn Ruppert
Senior Policy Analyst
Association of Municipalities of Ontario

Lou Sage
C.A.O., City of Hamilton

Barton Sala
Ontario Hydro

Edward Sarafian
Policy and Planning Secretariat
Ministry of Government Services

Rosanna Scotti
Director, Corporate Administration
C.A.O. Department
Metropolitan Toronto

Rudy Segovia
Manager, Administration
C.A.O., Metro Toronto

Kennedy Self
Manager of Planning, Toronto
Tottem Sims Hubicki Associates

David Shiner
Councillor, City of North York

Kathleen Sharpe
Chief Administrator Officer's Department
Metropolitan Toronto

Robert Short
Director of Planning
Town of Whitby

Mayor Bruce Sinclair
City of Etobicoke

Richard Soberman
Chairman, Department of Civil Engineering
University of Toronto

Scott Somerville
C.A.O., City of Vaughan

W. Somer
Department of Building and Inspections
City of Toronto

Elizabeth Stanley
Supervisor, Regional and GTA Planning
Ministry of Environment

Art Stevenson
Executive Director
Management Services
City of Toronto

Betty Strauss
Manager, Buildings Department
City of Toronto

Richard Stren
Director
Centre for Urban and Community Studies
University of Toronto

Carmen Suchorab
Senior Manager
Ministry of Government Services

Marcia Sypnowich
Assistant to Deputy Minister
Ministry of Municipal Affairs

Gordon Thomson
Director of Public Services
North York Library

Mike Toombs
Office of the Greater Toronto Area

Chris Toomey
Planning Department
Town of East Gwillembury

Nicholas Vardin
Commissioner
Department of Public Works and the Environment
City of Toronto

Dr. Paula Warwick
Ministry of Education

Jane Welsh
Planner
Metro Planning

David S. Weinberg
President
CIBC Development Corp.

Stephanie White
Student, York University

Lynn Williams
Ontario Hydro

Diane Wolfenden
Acting Director, Public Affairs
City of Mississauga

John W. Wouters
Vice President
Corporation House

Gary Wright
Manager, Community Improvement Section
Planning & Development Department
City of Toronto

Jennifer Young
Office of the Greater Toronto Area

John Yudelman
Senior Policy Advisor
Recreation Policy Branch
Ministry of Tourism and Recreation

Ed Zamparo
Senior Corporate Planner
Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto

Marek Zawadzki
Russocki & Zawadzki Architects Inc.

Norris P. Zucchet
President
The Parking Authority of Toronto